

The Classical Review

SEPTEMBER, 1913

ORIGINAL CONTRIBUTIONS

ON THE 'CAUSAL' USE OF 'OTE' AND 'OTAN' IN SOPHOCLES.¹

MR. PEARSON has shown (1) that *ὅταν*, like *ὅτε*, has a tendency to lose temporal significance and become causal; (2) that this tendency is at work already in good Attic authors; (3) that the classification of *ὅταν* clauses as either 'future' or 'expressive of indefinite frequency' is misleading. In Sophocles, as this paper will try to show, (1) the temporal significance is more stubborn than Mr. Pearson seems to suggest; and (2) *ὅταν* means something different from *ὅτε*, even where the temporal significance has faded.

I.

(a) Normal, purely temporal use (fragments omitted, because the dramatic context is necessary). *ὅτε* = *quando*, 'at the time when,' in *Phil.* 1271 (Jebb), 1312, *O.R.* 391, *O.C.* 87, 356, 437, 591, 766, *Ant.* 268, 565, *Trach.* 258, 688, *Ai.* 1283, *El.* 195, 683, 698, 1264 (Jebb, *εὐτε*). *ὅτε* = *nunc cum*, with present indicative (Ellendt, '*de rebus una factis*') in *Trach.* 711, *O.C.* 393, 1358, *Ant.* 804. Other purely temporal cases I quote because they illustrate the dramatic quality of Sophoclean syntax: the speaker seems to think as he talks and to form his sentence as he thinks: *Phil.* 5 *sqq.* *ἐξέθηκ' ἐγώ*

ποτε, | *ταχθεῖς* . . . , | *νόσφ καταστάζοντα* . . . | *ὅτ' οὔτε λοιβῆς οὔτε θυμάτων* | *παρὴν ἐκήλοις προσθιγείν*. Here *ὅτε*, 'when it came to this that . . .,' does not answer to *ποτε*, but continues the 'palliation of the conduct of the chiefs' which is begun in v. 7 (Jebb). In *Phil.* 395 Troy, though not mentioned, is in the minds of the chorus, and we have *σὲ κάκει* . . . *ἐπηνύδωμαν* . . . *ὅτε* instead of a dreary *τότε* . . . *ὅτε*. This helps us to see the fine psychology of *O.R.* 801 *τριπλῆς* | *ὅτ' ἡ κελεύθου τῆσδ' ὁδοιπορῶν πέλας* | *ἐνταῦθα* . . . , where, in the syntax of Oedipus, who noticed nothing in Jocasta's speech after her mention of the cross-roads, place naturally drives out time. In *O.C.* 1035 the use of *χῶτε* for *καὶ τὰ τότε ὅτε* suggests the pounce of indignation, and in *O.C.* 1221 the use of *ὅτε* with indicative (*ὅτε μοῖρ' . . . ἀναπέφηνε*), where the generalised *ὅταν* *ἔλθῃ θάνατος* would be quite natural, makes death seem to emerge as a concrete reality, present here and now: the effect of this is still felt in *ἐπιέλογχε γῆρας*. In *Trach.* 240 the loose *εὐχαῖς ὅθ' ἤρει* suits Lichas, and the effect is recalled in the emotion of Hyllus v. 750. In *El.* 533 *ὅτ' ἐσπείρ'* is temporal and normal, though *ἡ τίκτουσ' ἐγώ* is substituted pathetically for 'I, when I gave her birth.'

(b) Cases really akin to *O.R.* 801 (*ὅτε* . . . *ἐνταῦθα*) are often classed as 'causal,' though *ὅτε*, when spoken, is purely temporal; the thought of the

¹ See the article on *The Use of ὅταν with Causal Implication*, by A. C. Pearson (*American Journal of Philology*, xxxiii. 4, 1912, pp. 426 *sqq.*), with the remarks of Professor Gildersleeve (*ibid.*, pp. 468 *sqq.*).

actor shifts, and the effect is dramatic. Consider *El.* 38. We start with ἡνίχ' *ἰκόμην*, then we have the vivid present *χρῆ μοι* as Orestes seems to hear the oracle again, then the general *τοιαῦτα* caught up into the particular *ὦν*, the pause and expectation of *πέυσει τάχα*, then the oracle, then *ὅτ' οὖν* (when therefore) *τοιούνδε χρῆσμον εἰσηκούσαμεν*—*σὺ μὲν μολών*. . . . *ἴσθι πᾶν τὸ δρώμενον*. Jebb says that *ὅτε* is causal. But only a poor actor would miss the opportunity of the sudden shift to energy of *σὺ μὲν* . . . , a shift which depends on the fact that *ὅτε*, when spoken, is temporal. Similarly in *O.R.* 918 *ὅτ' οὖν παραινοῦς' οὐδὲν ἐς πλεόν ποιῶ, πρὸς σ' ὦ Λύκει' Ἀπολλων* . . . *ἰκέτις ἀφύγμαι, ὅτε* means 'when,' and is dramatically abandoned as Jocasta turns to Apollo. In *El.* 1318, *ὅτ' οὖν τοιαύτην ἡμῖν ἐξήκεις ὁδόν, | ἄρχ' αὐτὸς ὥς σοι θυμός* . . . , we are inclined to agree that *ὅτε* really means 'since' until we read aloud from 1311 and discover that *ἄρχε* is another shift to energy like *σὺ μὲν* . . . in 38. Finally, consider *Ant.* 170, *ὅτ' οὖν* . . . *ῶλοντο* . . . *ἐγὼ κράτη* . . . *ἔχω*. The aorist, says Ellendt, usurps the function of a perfect, and the clause = *ἐπειδὴ ὀλώλασιν*. But Creon means what he says. He is not logical, but he is alive. The irregularity which gives life is not in the use of *ὅτε* but in the vivid present *ἔχω*, an assertion of Creon's claims and a revelation of his character. See how the whole paragraph leads up to *ἐγὼ*. *τὰ μὲν δὴ πόλεος ἀσφαλῶς θεοὶ* (cf. *Aesch. Sept.*) . . . *ῶρθωσαν* . . . *ὑμᾶς δ' ἐγὼ* . . . *τοῦτο μὲν τὰ Λαίου σέβοντας εἰδὼς εὐ θρόνων αἰεὶ κράτη, τοῦτ' αὖθις ἡνίκ' Οἰδίπους ῶρθον πόλιν, καπὲι διώλετ'* . . . faithful to his sons, . . . 'well then, when they perished . . . I AM KING.' To suppose that *ὅτε* = *ἐπειδὴ* and *ῶλοντο* = *ὀλώλασιν* is to miss the dramatic power of Sophocles.

(c) There are some instances (rightly, I think, classed as temporal by Ellendt) in which, though *ὅτε* certainly does not = *ἐπειδὴ*, there is a causal implication lurking behind the temporal. In *El.* 788 *νῦν γὰρ οἰμῶξαι πάρα, | Ὀρεστα, τὴν σὴν ξυμφορὰν ὅθ' ὥδ' ἔχων | πρὸς τῆσδ' ὑβρίζει* . . . the stress is on *νῦν* (reinforced by *ὥδε, τῆσδε*) and *ὅτε* means 'for now.' In *Ai.* 706 *νῦν αὖ νῦν* . . .

πάρα . . . *ὅτ' Αἴας λαθίπονος πάλιν*, the threatened temporal implication is preserved again by *νῦν* ('now . . . for now . . .') and made clearer by *πάνθ' ὁ μέγας χρόνος μαραίνει* . . .

In *O.C.* 203 *ὅτε νῦν χαλᾶς, αὐδασον* . . . , though we are one step nearer pure causality, *ὅτε* is still temporal, since *αὐδασον* abruptly marks the end of the slow musical movement of the withdrawal of Oedipus from sanctuary (cf. 192 *μηκέτι* . . . *ἄλως*). The effect is somewhat similar to that of examples in class (b).

(d) Even in the few cases in which the causal implication is fairly clear, *ὅτε* is used deliberately, and means 'for now,' not simply 'since.' Thus in *El.* 1328 *ἡ νοῦς ἔνεστιν οὗτις ὑμῖν ἐγγενὴς | ὅτ' οὐ παρ' αὐτοῖς ἀλλ' ἐν αὐτοῖσιν κακοῖς* . . . *ὄντες* . . . *οὐ γινώσκετε, ὅτε* is chosen because, with the words that follow, it suggests the meaning 'now, at this vital moment.' *Ai.* 167 *ἀλλ' ὅτε γὰρ δὴ τὸ σὸν ὄμμα ἀπέδραν, παταγοῦσιν* . . . means 'but though, it's very true, they chatter now, for now . . . , they will not chatter for long.' *ὅτε* in *Ai.* 1093 *οὐκ ἂν ποτ' ἄνδρες ἄνδρα θανμάσαιμι ἔτι | ὅς μηδὲν ὦν γοναῖσιν εἶθ' ἁμαρτάνει, | ὅθ' οἱ δοκοῦντες εὐγενεῖς πεφυκέναι | τοιαῦθ' ἁμαρτάνουσιν* . . . , wrenches the sentence from general to particular, and drives home the point as a personal taunt: the effect obtained is recalled in 1228, where Agamemnon, thinking to return the taunt, merely illustrates its truth—*ἡ που τραφεῖς ἂν μητρὸς εὐγενεὺς ἄπο | ὑψηλ' ἐφώνεις* . . . | *ὅτ' οὐδὲν ὦν τοῦ μηδὲν ἀντέστης ὑπερ*. In *Phil.* 428—*τί δῆτα δεῖ σκοπεῖν, ὅθ' οἶδε μὲν | τεθνᾶς, Ὀδυσσεὺς δ' ἔστιν αὖ κἀνταῦθ' ἵνα | χρῆν ἄντι τούτων αὐτὸν ἀνδᾶσθαι νεκρόν*;—the effect is 'Now, now what is to be thought? Here is the situation—these dead and . . . ' The skilful use of *ἵνα* helps.

II.

We have found no instance in Sophocles in which *ὅτε* simply = *ἐπειδὴ*. Even where *ὅτε* is least temporal, it is arresting and has its effect, particularising a general phrase, vividly recalling us to the situation of the moment. In *Thuc.* 2. 60, *ὅποτε οὖν πόλεις μὲν τὰς ἰδίας ξυμφορὰς οἶα τε φέρειν* . . . *πῶς οὐ*

χρῇ πάντας ἀμύνειν αὐτῇ, καὶ μὴ, ὃ νῦν ὑμεῖς δρᾶτε . . . ἀφίεσθε (not ἀφίεσθαι), a similar effect is obtained: ὅποτε ties down the reference to Athens, and the shift is made explicit in the following words: the particularising, started by ὅποτε, is carried on by ὑμεῖς δρᾶτε and completed by ἀφίεσθε.

The shift from general to particular, and vice versa, is a common device of Greek writers and notably of Sophocles. A good instance is *Ant.* 375 δς τὰδ' ἔρδει. Here the general reference is not excluded, but the form of the phrase suggests the particular, 'the culprit'—and, of course, at once, 'Enter Antigone, guarded.'

With regard to ὅταν clauses, it is commonly said that they express either 'futurity' or 'indefinite frequency.' I agree that the words 'frequency,' 'Wiederholung,' and the like are misleading; 'generic' is better, but still misleading. 'Indefinite' is better still, for it seems to suggest the truth about 'future' clauses as well as the rest. However precise our forecast, there is something undetermined about the future, and the indeterminate mood is appropriate. In hypotheses about the future, Greek, with a modesty remarkably contrasted with the Latin use of future indicative and the bold present indicative of modern English, retains subjunctive with ἄν. When the Greeks ceased to use the subjunctive in main clauses for assertions about the future, they usurped the function of providence; when they flew from subjunctive to indicative in 'minatory and monitory' clauses, they treated the hypothesis as if it belonged to the definite world of past and present. ἔαν with subjunctive means 'given circumstances in which,' εἰ with indicative 'given the fact that. . . .' So ὅταν with subjunctive means 'at a time when' or 'in circumstances in which. . . ,' ὅτε 'at the time when' or 'on the occasion on which.' Fading of the temporal significance does not necessarily obscure the modal distinction, and in Sophocles, at any rate, the modal distinction is always felt.

1. A few quite normal cases may be quoted as guides. In *Ant.* 35 τὸ πρῶγμ' ἄγειν | οὐχ ὡς παρ' οὐδέν, ἀλλ' ὅς ἄν

τούτων τι δρᾶ | φόνον προκεῖσθαι, it is more satisfactory to say that δς ἄν with the subjunctive makes the clause 'indefinite,' than to call the clause exclusively either 'future' or 'generic': *Ant.* 522 οὗτοι ποθ' οὐχθρὸς, οὐδ' ὅταν θάνῃ, φίλος, is 'generic,' of course—but how if the context were different and the next line began with ἔσται? Without context, again, we could not say whether *El.* 1251, ὅταν παρουσία φράξῃ τότ' ἔργων τῶνδε μεμνήσθαι χρεών, referred to the future or not. Not repetition, but 'indefiniteness,' is the characteristic of the normal temporal use in *Ant.* 423, κἀνακακῶκει πικρὰς | ὄρνιθος ὁξὺν φθογγὸν ὡς ὅταν κειῆς | εὐνῆς νεοσσὼν ὄρφανὸν βλέψῃ λέχος, 'as the bird, at a time when. . . .'

2. *O.R.* 618 ὅταν ταχύς τις οὐπι-βουλεύων λάθρα | χωρῇ, ταχὺν δὲ κἀμέ βουλεύειν πάλιν, approaches more nearly Mr. Pearson's instances. Here the reference is particular, the form deliberately generalised. The suspicious king might have said 'since,' but he did not. He said 'in a case where. . . ,' 'where it is a case of. . . .' κἀμέ makes the first reference to the particular, and the concrete flashes out in the vivid indicative of εἰ δ' ἡσυχάζων προσμενῶ, τὰ τοῦδε μὲν | πεπραγμέν' ἔσται, τὰμὰ δ' ἡμαρτημένα; at the end the neuter plural and passive participles give a sense of falling back into vagueness and gloom.

3. Consider now *Phil.* 451, ποῦ χρῇ τιθέσθαι ταῦτα, ποῦ δ' αἰνεῖν, ὅταν | τὰ θεῖ' ἐπαινῶν τοὺς θεοὺς εὖρω κακοὺς (Jebb, 'seeing that, while one praises the gods. . .'). Here ὅταν generalises the particular ταῦτα, and the shift is made easier by the fact that ταῦτα is ambiguous, referring, when spoken, to what has been said before, but felt at the end of the sentence as antecedent to ὅταν. ὅτε would mean something bolder, rather impious, 'since now in this case I find. . .': ὅταν is chosen because it gives an indefinite form, and means 'what am I to think, where I find. . . ,' 'in a case of finding. . . .' A similar case is *El.* 59, τί γάρ με λυπεῖ τοῦθ' ὅταν λόγῳ θανῶν | ἔργοισι σωθῶ; where ὅτε. . . would mean something like 'I am dying only to be saved, and there is no hurt in that,' but ὅταν. . . means 'there's no hurt in that, no

hurt in (my) dying to be saved. τοῦτο, when first heard, means 'my pretended death,' but gets a fresh meaning from the words that follow. It is a mistake to say that ὅταν σωθῶ = 'when I shall have come to life,' and λυπεῖ practically = λυπήσει. In a Greek sentence οὐδὲν με λυπεῖ ὅταν σωθῶ, ὅταν with subjunctive has *precisely* the same effect as in the sentence οὐδὲν δεινὸν ὅταν τις σωθῇ. In *El.* 1007, οὐ γὰρ θανεῖν ἔχθιστον, ἀλλ' ὅταν θανεῖν | χρῆζων τις εἴτα μηδὲ τοῦτ' ἔχῃ λαβεῖν, we might have had, without any loss of the generalising effect of the subjunctive (though of course the *total effect* would have been less indefinite), οὐ μοι θανεῖν ἔχθιστον ἀλλ' ὅταν . . . ἔχω. The choice of the indefinite form in *El.* 59 seems to be determined by that desire for cautious expression which dictates the whole passage.

4. In the light of these examples we may consider Mr. Pearson's cases. Take first the 'transitional' εὐ νῦν ἐπίστω ταῦθ' ὅταν ζητῆς ἐμοὶ | ζητῶν ὄλεθρον . . . *O.R.* 658. As Mr. Pearson says, 'the request has been made,' and there is no thought of 'repetition.' Yet ὅταν is not used at random. Oedipus wants to refuse: his phrase avoids the admission even that the request has been made. He says, not 'since you make this request' (ἐπειδὴ), not 'now that . . .', or 'since *now* . . .' (ὅτε), but 'a request for that (from you) means. . .'. The phrase is more personal, but, so far as the ὅταν with subjunctive goes, not less general than ὅταν τις ταῦτα ζητῇ, ζητέῃ. The psychology of Oedipus explains the generalised phrase. ὁ δ' οὖν ἴτω . . . breaks out as an admirable contrast.¹

¹ This is the explanation of Professor Hale's instances, where the 'identification' of two 'acts' is asserted. The formula ὅταν λέγῃς . . . λέγεις . . . is correct in argument, where the point is 'A implies B.' Greek says 'a making (by you) of statement A implies a corresponding making by you of statement B.' Further, the use of ὅταν λέγῃ ὁ δαίμων in introducing quotations is often quite correct. In *Aesch.* 1. 128 ὅταν generalises ('this statement by Euripides implies . . .'). The instances in *Plato Ion.* 538B, C, are like *Phil.* 451 ('when we have Homer saying . . .'). In *Rep.* 383A, though ὅταν can hardly be said to generalise, the future ἐπαυσεόμεθα helps. This example, however, and *Rep.* 339E show that ὅταν is losing its force.

The most important of Mr. Pearson's examples is *At.* 136, σέ μὲν εὖ πρᾶσσοντ' ἐπιχαίρω, | σέ δ' ὅταν πληγὴ Διὸς ἢ ζαμενῆς | λόγος ἐκ Δαναῶν κακόθρους ἐπιβῇ, | μέγαν ὄκνον ἔχω καὶ πεφόβημαι. . . . I agree that πληγὴ Διὸς is final, irrevocable doom. It makes nonsense to translate 'whenever.' But does that prove that we should translate 'as in general . . . so now, when . . .'? To have said 'so now, when either the stroke of God or slander—one or the other—has come upon you' would have been ill-omened. As always, the thought of the Sophoclean actor runs into shape as he speaks. First by their choice of ὅταν with subjunctive, next by the suggestion of possible slander, the chorus make innocuous their mention of πληγὴ Διὸς. True, πεφόβημαι means 'I am now in a state of terror'; but the sentence means 'now, at a time for you of slander or even θεία νόσος,' 'now, when it is for you a case of κακόθρους λόγος, or even πληγὴ Διὸς. . .'. ἥκοι γὰρ ἂν θεία νόσος gets a similar effect by a different method. Even when they are obliged to admit the worst, these cautious friends only say δέδοικα μὴ . . . ὅτε . . . ἐπέβη . . . would have meant 'on this occasion on which one of these two things has happened.' ὅταν . . . ἐπιβῇ means 'in this case, which is one of the cases where it must be one of these two things—your being slandered or lost' (the English order of words is not the Greek, and that fact makes a difference). In fact, the chorus by this idiom avoid the shock of saying ὅτε πληγὴ Διὸς ἐπέβη.

It is impossible here to discuss all Mr. Pearson's instances, but a few must be mentioned. In *Eur. Ion.* 743, βάκτρῳ δ' ἐρείδον . . . | καὶ τοῦτο τυφλὸν ὅταν ἐγὼ βλέπω βραχύ, Mr. Pearson, rightly objecting to Shilleto's 'when one like me . . .', translates 'that (my staff) is a blind guide, *now that* my sight is dim.' This misses the stress on ἐγὼ. The sense is 'where the man himself has bad sight, the stick is blind *as well*,' and this is expressed in the form (quite good Greek, as we have tried to show) 'where it is a case of *myself* having poor sight, my stick loses its sight.' Neither the introduction of the particular person ἐγὼ, nor the fact that the speaker really

is shortsighted, prevents the subjunctive with *ἄν* from exercising its generalising force. In Thuc. i. 141, though Shilleto laid too much stress on the temporal force of *ἔταν*, he was right in saying that the clause is generalised—'the P. with their way of. . . ' *ἔτε* would be out of place. Similarly with 'explicative' *ἔταν*. *Ηec*, 306 *ἐν τῷδε γὰρ κάμνουσιν αἱ πολλαὶ πόλεις ἔταν τις* . . . means 'this is where most cities κάμνουσιν, in their . . . , in the cases that occur of.' Soph. *Fr.* 74, 'that is the matter in which . . . , their way of. . . ' *ἐν τῷδε, ἐνταῦθα* (not κάμ-

νουσιν, νοσεῖ) are explained and generalised by *ἔταν*.

It should be said in conclusion that the generalising force of the subjunctive with *ἄν* was not likely to check, but rather to promote the development of a causal implication. If we may judge by the use of *ὅστις*, the Greeks tended to generalise their causal relatives, and if *ὅτε* could come to mean 'because,' it was likely that its functions should be usurped by *ἔταν*.

J. T. SHEPPARD.

King's College, Cambridge.

HOMERICA II. ADDITIONS TO THE EPIC CYCLE.

I AM distressed to find that the collection of fragments of the Epic Cycle in the Oxford Homer, vol. v. (1911), is incomplete. In this article I endeavour to make these deficiencies good, without waiting for the animadversions of critics. There is indeed no evidence that more than one human eye has fallen on this part of the book, not even that of the reviewer of the *Guardian*, who accords it a benevolent notice under the head of 'Recent School Books.' I owe an apology to Professor Ludwich for overlooking the material on Cypria, fr. I., which he published *Rhein. Mus.*, 1888, p. 472, and, as I see from his magnanimous notice, *Berl. Phil. Wochenschrift*, 14 Dez., 1912, the still fuller collections in his *Textkr. Untersuch. iib. die mythol. Schol. zu Homer's Ilias I.*, 1900. Acting on the discovery of this omission, I have consulted, on Cypria, fr. I. and X., such MSS. as I could lay my hand on.

CYPRIA, FR. I.

Schol. A5 (MSS. A, *Ang. Barocci 216 s. xv., Harley 5727 s. xv., *Laur. 57. 36, *M7, *M11 O8 P11 P21 R1 *Vat. 33 Ve Vi 4 *W3. Those marked * are quoted on the authority of Ludwich *l.c.* I have reduced such of them as contain the *Iliad* to my own notation).

ἡ δὲ ἱστορία παρὰ Στασίνῳ τῷ τὰ Κύπρια πεποιηκότι, εἰπόντι οὕτως·

ἦν ὅτε μυρία φύλα κατὰ χθόνα πλαζο-
μένων περ
ἀνθρώπων ἐβάρυνε βαθυστέρνου πλάτος
αἵης,
Ζεὺς δὲ ἰδὼν ἐλέησε καὶ ἐν πυκναῖς
πραπίδεσσι
σύνθετο κούφισαι ἀνθρώπων παμβώ-
τορα γαῖαν,
5 ῥιπίσσας πολέμου μεγάλην ἔριν Ἰλίου
κοῖο
ὄφρα κενώσκειεν θανάτου βάρος· οἱ δ'
ἐνὶ Τροίῃ
ἥρωες κτείνοντο· Διὸς δ' ἐτελείετο
βουλή.

[Στασίνῳ] τασίνῳ A P11 W3 τα σεινω Ve ταρα-
σίνῳ Barocci 216 O8 Vat. 33 ταρασίνῳ Ang. M7
P21 R1 Harl. 5727 ταρσίνῳ Vi 4 ταρασιω Laur.
57. 36.
Cypriorum versus om. Barocci 216.

1. πλαζόμενα περ Laur. 57. 36 corr. Ludwich, πλαζόμενα cet. πλαζόμεν' ἀνδρῶν Barnes.
2. ἀνθρώπων add. Ludwich ἐκπάγλως Schneidewin: ἐβάρυνε add. Boissonade. βαρυστέρνου (βαρυστόνου A M7) codd. corr. ed. pr. 1517.
3. αἵησε Vi 4 ὄκτειρ' ἄρα Laur. 57. 36.
ἐν om. Harl. 5727 M11 P21 R1.
4. παμβώτορα[τερα P21 -τεiran Vi 4] γαῖαν [γαῖην Laur. 57. 36 M7 M11 P11 Vi 4 γαῖης A Vat. 33 Ve] ἀνθρώπων codd. praeter Ang.
5. ῥιπίσσας Ang. P11 ῥιπίσαι τε A ῥιπίσαι cet.
τ
6. θανάτῳ ed. 1517 θανά Laur. 57. 23.
οἱ δὲ ἐν codd. praeter Ang.
7. διὸς-βουλή om. Harl. 5727 M11 P11 P21 R1.

The new variants unfortunately do not assist the reconstruction of the text.

CYPRIA, FR. X.

Schol. Γ 242.

(MSS. A, Et, Harl. 5727, Lei,¹ P9
P11 P21 Pal. 222 V11.²)

Ἑλένη ἀρπασθεῖσα ὑπὸ Ἀλεξάνδρου
ἀγνοοῦσα τὸ συμβεβηκὸς μεταξὺ τοῖς
ἀδελφοῖς Διοσκούροις κακόν, ὑπολαμ-
βάνει δι' αἰσχύνης αὐτῆς μὴ πεπο-
5 ρεύσθαι τούτους εἰς Ἴλιον, ἐπειδὴ προ-
τέρως ὑπὸ Θησέως ἡρπάσθη, καθὼς
προεῖρηται· διὰ γὰρ τὴν τότε γενο-
μένην ἀρπαγὴν Ἀφιδνα πόλις Ἀττικῆς
πορθεῖται, καὶ τιτρώσκεται Κάστωρ
10 ὑπὸ Ἀφιδνου τοῦ τότε βασιλέως κατὰ
τὸν δεξιὸν μηρόν. οἱ δὲ Διόσκουροι
Θησέως μὴ τυχόντες λαφυραγωγοῦσι
τὰς Ἀθήνας· ἡ ἱστορία παρὰ τοῖς
Πολεμωνίοις (FHG III. 118) ἢ τοῖς
15 κυκλικοῖς, καὶ ἀπὸ μέρους παρὰ Ἀλκ-
μάνι τῷ λυρικῷ.

1. ἀρπαγείσα Et Harl. Lei P21.
μενελάου P9.
3. ὑπολαμβάνειν A ὑπελάμβανε P9.
4. αἰσχύνην Harl. Lei P21.
πορεύεσθαι Harl. Lei P9 P11 P21.
5. καὶ προτέρως P9 πρότερον Harl. Lei P11.
6. ἡρπάγη Harl. P11 ἀρπάγη P21.
καθὼς προ. om. Lei.
7. ταύτην τὴν P11.
γινομένην A.
8. ἀρπαγὴν] γρ. ἐσπέσθην P21.
ἀφίδα P9 ἀφείδια Harl. P21 αἰφνιδίως P21.
δ λ
ἀφνι πο Lei.
ἀφνίδα πόλιν Et.
τῆς ἀττικῆς P11.
9. πορθοῦνται Lei.
10. ὑπὸ φιδνου A P9 P11 φδίνου Harl. P21.
διδνου τοῦτο γε Et.
διδνου Lei.
13. ἀθήνας codd. ἀφιδνας ed. 1517.
14. λεμωνίους Harl. P21 τελαμωνίους V11.
ἦτοι τοῖς Harl. 5727 Pal. 222 ed. 1517.
16. λυρικῷ Harl. 5727.

The lines quoted by Plutarch, *Thes.* 32,
from Hereas <FHG IV. 426> Ἡρέας
δ' ὑπὸ Θησέως αὐτοῦ περὶ Ἀφιδνας ἀπο-
θανεῖν τὸν Ἀλυκὸν ἰστόρηκε καὶ μαρτύρια
ταυτὰ τὰ ἔπη παρέχεται περὶ τοῦ Ἀλυκοῦ·

τὸν ἐν εὐρυχώρῳ ποτ' Ἀφιδνῇ
μαρνιάμενον Θησεύς Ἑλένης ἔνεκ' ἠυκόμοιο
κτείνειν

may have come from this part of the
Cypria. The absence of an author's

¹ Adduced by Valckenar opusc. II. 95 sqq.
I have inspected the scholium.

² Adduced by Baumeister, *Philol.* XI. 168.

name makes Hesiod somewhat less
likely. Cf. Nostoi, fr. XIV.

AETHIOPIIS.

Scholl. AB Lei ed. 1517 on Ψ 660.

Φόρβας ἀνδρείοτατος τῶν καθ' αὐτὸν
γενόμενος, ὑπερήφανος δέ, πυγμὴν
ἤσκησεν, καὶ τοὺς μὲν παριόντας ἀναγ-
κάζων ἀγωνίζεσθαι ἀνῆρει, ὑπὸ δὲ τῆς
5 πολλῆς ὑπερηφανίας ἠβούλετο καὶ πρὸς
τοὺς θεοὺς τὸ ἴσον φρόνημα ἔχειν. διὸ
Ἀπόλλων παραγενόμενος καὶ συστάς
αὐτῷ ἀπέκτεινεν αὐτόν· ὅθεν ἐξ ἐκείνου
καὶ τῆς πυκτικῆς ἔφορος ἐνομήσθη ὁ
10 θεός· ἡ ἱστορία παρὰ τοῖς κυκλικοῖς.

1. ἀνδρείοτερος Lei.
2. γενόμενος πυγμῇ ἐνίκα καὶ τοὺς μὲν Lei.
3. ἀγωνίζεσθαι ἀναγκάζων Lei.
6. τὸ ἴσον] τοιοῦτο A.

No such likely place for this story ap-
pears as the games after Achilles' death:
οἱ δὲ Ἀχαιοὶ τὸν τάφον χῶσαντες ἀγῶνα
τιθέασιν Proclus. The ancestry of
Epeus was probably given in greater
detail: Phorbas who lived at Panopeus
can hardly be other than Panopeus,
father of Epeus. Arctinus improved on
his model. The fragment should be
numbered II, and the actual II became
III.

ILIAS PARVA IV.

Besides schol. T on T326 the scholia
Band minn. on the same line should have
been cited. These end with ἡ ἱστορία
παρὰ τοῖς κυκλικοῖς, and as that here is
equivalent to ὁ τὴν μικρὰν Ἰλιάδα of T,
we are able to make the equation general.
Cf. also Thebais, fr. 4.

Perhaps a new fragment should be
added from Athenaeus 73 E, who says,

καὶ λευχῆς (λάχης the Laurentian epit-
ome)
ὥς δ' ἔτ' ἀέξεται σικνὺς δροσερῷ ἐνὶ
χώρῳ,

where λέσσης occurred to Kaibel.

ILIU PERSIS.

Σ 486: the scholion contained in A
and the edition of 1517 upon the
Pleiades ends with ἡ ἱστορία παρὰ τοῖς
κυκλικοῖς. The statement immediately
before the end, φασὶ δὲ Ἠλέκτραν οὐ
βουλομένην τὴν Ἰλίου πόρθησιν θεάσ-
ασθαι διὰ τὸ κτίσμα εἶναι τῶν ἀπογόνων

καταλιπεῖν τὸν τόπον οὗ κατηστέριστο·
διόπερ οὐσας πρότερον ζ' γενέσθαι ε',
points to Arctinus' second poem. From
it Aratus borrowed the fancy (ἐν τῷ
πρὸς Θεόπομπον ἐπικηδεῖω further in
the same scholium).

NOSTOI, FR. XIII.

Athen. 399A. ὁ τὴν τῶν Ἀτρειδῶν
κάθοδον πεποικηκώς ἐν τῷ τρίτῳ φησιν

ἴσον δ' Ἑρμῶν ποσὶ καρπαλίμοισι
μετασπών
ψύας ἔγχει νύξε.

FR. XIV.

Athen. 317A. ὁμοίως ἱστορεῖ καὶ
Κλέαρχος ἐν β' περὶ παροιμιῶν <FHG
II. 318> παρατιθέμενος τάδε τὰ ἔπη, οὗ
δηλὸν ὅτου ἐστι·

πυλῦποδός μοι τέκνον ἔχων νόον Ἀμφί-
λοχ' ἦρωσ
τοῖσιν ἐφαρμόζου τῶν κεν κατὰ δῆμον
ἱκται.

Antigonus Carystius, c. 29: ὕθεν
δῆλον καὶ ὁ ποιητὴς τὸ θρυλούμενον
ἔγραψεν [πουλ.—ἐφαρμόζειν]:

1. μοι] ὥς Antig.
νόον-ἦρωσ] ἐν στήθεσι θυμόν Antig.
2. ἐφαρμόζειν Ant.]

This may have come from the *Nostoi*;
οἱ δὲ περὶ Κάλχαντα καὶ Λεοντέα καὶ
Πολυποίτην περὶ πορευθέντες εἰς Κολο-
φῶνα Τειρεσίαν ἐνταῦθα τελευτήσαντα
θάπτει Proclus. Herod. III. 91, ἀπὸ δὲ
Ποσειδῆιον πόλεως, τὴν Ἀμφίλοχος ὁ
Ἀμφιάρεω οἴκισε ἐπ' οὐροῖσι τοῖσι Κιλι-
κων τε καὶ Σύρων. VII. 91, οἱ δὲ
Πάμφιλοι οὗτοι εἰσὶ τῶν ἐκ Τροίης
ἀποσκευασθέντων ἅμα Ἀμφιλόχῳ καὶ
Κάλχαντι. The oldest authorities for
these Lapith settlements, accompanied
by a *luxu* of prophets, are Hesiod fr. 160,
Callinus fr. 8. For other references
see Roscher in v. The other author-
ities represent Calchas, not Tiresias, as
dying at Colophon. Still the two lines
quoted by Clearchus show Tiresias as
a practical counsellor, as in Horace,

Serm. II. 5, and to Menippus in Lucian.
For the Greeks in Cilicia see L. W.
King, *J.H.S.*, 1910, 327, 'Sennacherib
and the Ionians.'

We must not ascribe all post-Homeric
wanderings to this poem, but Strabo
deserves mention where (416) he says
that the Pontic Achaei were ἀποικοι
'Ὀρχομενίων τῶν μετὰ Ἰαλμένου πλανη-
θέντων ἐκείσε μετὰ τὴν τῆς Τροίας
ἄλωσης, and Demosthenes of Bithynia
FHG IV. 385, fr. 12, who makes
Meriones go to Paphlagonia.

TELEGONIA, FR. II.

Athen. 412D γέρων τε ὦν [Ulysses]

ἦσθιεν ἀρπαλέως κρέα τ' ἄσπετα καὶ
μέθυ ἡδύ.

Unless it came from the source of the
Telegonia, Musaeus' poem (Clem. Alex.
strom. VI. 2. 25. 1), the Thesprotia or
Thesprotis. From this poem may have
come also the variant *τομοῦροι*, π 403;
the statement ap. Aristotel. fr. 464 Rose
(FHG II. 147) that Neoptolemus was
called in to arbitrate between the
Ithacans and Ulysses (Neoptolemus we
know retired to the Molossi, whence
the dynasty or part of the inhabitants
of the Pelasgic Argos perhaps came;
see Wace and Thompson, *Prehistoric
Thessaly*, p. 246); and the statement ap.
Lysimach. fr. 17 FHG III. 333 that
Ulysses married Evippe of Thesprotia.

I take this opportunity to make a
correction in my emendation of the
Eivresione (vit. Suid. 192, Homer, vol. v.
p. 266): it should run *πέρσι* (not
πέρσει) Ἀπόλλωνος λιγυστάδου. The
MS. of Athenaeus 649 A *sqq.* give the
forms *πέρσια*, *πέρσιον* (and in 198 B
περσείας, *περσεας*). The genitive in
this connection is idiomatic.

I regret to have omitted Crusius'
suggestions (*Anthologia Lyrica*⁴ p. lxxi):
πῆρης or *πῆρη* for *πέρσαι*, and *ἀγυρτίδος*
or *ἀγυρτίδι* for *γυιάτιδος*.

T. W. ALLEN.

KLODONES, MIMALLONES AND DIONYSUS PSEUDANOR.

THE etymology and significance of
the first two of these names have
not been satisfactorily explained. Hoff-

man¹ says of Klodones and Mimallones:
'Griechisch war der eine Name eben-

¹ *Die Macedonen*, p. 98.

sowenig wie der andere.' He is here concerned to do away with the false etymology of κλώδωνες from κλώζω, pointing out that the latter word has the stem κλωγ- not κλωδ-. He suggests as a possible derivation of ψευδάνωρ the Thracio-Phrygian Savadiss.

For Mimallones the etymology suggested by Tümpel in Roscher's Lexikon is that the name is derived from μαλλός, in the sense of πλοκάμων μαλλοί (Eur. *Bacchants*, 113), which Tümpel interprets as κεχυμένοι τὰς τρίχας (*Ath.* 5, p. 198E), comparing Ovid's description (*Ars. Am.* 1. 541) 'ecce Mimmallonidas sparsis in terga capillis.'

I hold that both κλώδωνες and μιμαλλόνες have originally to do with the art of spinning, κλώδωνες being derived from κλώθω¹ and μιμαλλόνες from μαλλός in the sense of τὸ ἔριον. The story told by Polyaeus (IV. 1) about the change of name from κλώδωνες to μιμαλλόνες gives a worthless etymology for the latter word, but at least shows that the former was not a warlike enough designation for the παρθέναι from the hills who routed the enemy. 'Spinners' is an appropriate name for such 'Wald- und Moosweibchen.' Mannhardt, in *Wald- und Feldkulte*, pp. 76 ff., describes fertility ceremonies that well illustrate the derivation I suggest for the two names of the Macedonian nymphs. 'Auch bei der Ernte lässt man im Frankenwald drei Hände voll Flachs für die Holzweibel auf dem Felde liegen.' 'Auch kleidet sich das Hülzfräulein in Flachshalme.' Wool is also taken to the 'Hollen' to spin. Professor Farnell (*Cults of Greek State*, v. 161) speaks of the fact that 'for the reproductive magic of vegetation the female garb, bringing with it the female power, may sometimes be essential, and therefore the god who was expected to perform vegetation-magic and the priest who officiated for him, might find it expedient to assume the female dress.' Professor Farnell explains thus (better than Hoffman) the cult of Dionysus ψευδάνωρ (the sham-

man), recorded by Polyaeus (IV. 1) in connection with the κλώδωνες, and the μιμαλλόνες. This female power would be augmented in the vegetation-magic by the woman's instrument, the spindle, and the flocks of wool, which have, as Pliny says (*N.H.* XXIX. 30), 'auctoritatem religiosam.' Pliny also speaks of the magic power of spindles in connection with agriculture: 'Pagana lege in plerisque Italiae praediis cavetur ne mulieres per itinera ambulantes torqueant fusos aut omnino delectos ferant, quoniam adversetur id omnium spei, praecipue frugum' (XXVIII. 29).

I have elsewhere discussed some evidence tending to show that the spindle is characteristic of Artemis, the goddess of women, rather than of Athena (*Trans. Am. Phil. Assoc.*, 1912). Artemis and Dionysus have much in common as vegetation deities, and their trains of nymphs are especially characteristic. 'The woman-ministrant was more essential to this (*i.e.*, the Dionysus) cult than to that of any other male divinity, and was never excluded as she frequently was in the others' (Farnell, *loc. cit.*). The interpretation of κλώδωνες as spinners, and of μιμαλλόνες as connected with μαλλός in the meaning of flock of wool seems in accord both with the female character of the God's worship and his power over the fertility of the fields.

One point more is very likely a mere coincidence, but an interesting one. Coins of Tarentum from 473 to 420 B.C. show a seated figure holding distaff and cantharus. The distaff bound with wool is regarded by Head (*H.N.*, p. 55) as 'symbolical of the commerce of the city.' Hands (*Coins of Magna Graecia*, 12, 13) regards the Krater and Distaff as 'mystic emblems.' He asks whether the distaff can be looked upon as a symbol of Dionysiac rites.

If the foregoing explanation of κλώδωνες and μιμαλλόνες is sound, I should think it possible that a religious significance as well as a commercial could be attached to the distaff on the Tarentine coins.

GRACE HARRIET MACURDY.

Vassar College.

¹ For the change of the aspirate to the middle characteristic of Macedonian dialect, see Hoffman, p. 240 *et passim*.

NOTES

NOTE ON PLATO *PHAEDO* 62A.

THE note I had originally written on this passage has been in some respects forestalled by Professor Burnet's edition of the *Phaedo*. There remain, however, some points of difference which may still justify its publication in a somewhat modified form.

The following free translation is intended to bring out the connection of thought. 'Perhaps, however, you will think it strange that here, though no where else, we should have a uniform rule; that is to say that human experience here is different from all other human experience, in not admitting exceptional cases—cases in which it is better to die than to live. And further, you probably think it strange that, in those cases where death is better than life, a man may not lawfully do for himself that which is best, but must wait for another to do it for him.'

Cebes has asked why suicide is to be regarded as unlawful—*κατὰ τί δὴ οὐκ ἐστὶν αὐτὸν εἶναι αὐτὸν ἀποκτινύναι*; Socrates takes up the question, and puts it, with some colloquial looseness of expression, in such a form as to suggest the difficulty that lay behind it in the mind of its author. 'Does not such a uniform rule involve the assumption that life is *always* better than death? But surely this depends on circumstances, like most questions of "better" or "worse." And if we admit the possibility of death being sometimes the better choice, why is a man to be debarred from choosing the better?'

In this reasoning two *ἀπορίαι* are involved, introduced by the similar form of words—*θαυμαστόν σοι φανέται*—*θαυμαστόν ἴσως σοι φαίνεται*. The first *ἀπορία* is virtually a criticism of the assumption that seems to be implied in the denial of the right of suicide—the assumption that life is *always* the better choice. 'The case is not so simple as this rule seems to make it. We cannot, in fact, believe what such a rule implies, that life is always and in all circumstances a better thing than death.' The first *ἀπορία* is now dis-

posed of, by the tacit rejection of the assumption 'life is always better.' But *ἀπορία* number two remains. 'The puzzle is, then, why, if circumstances arise in which death is seen to be preferable to life, a man may not take the responsibility of choosing the better thing.' *ἀπορία* number two actually states the question to be discussed; *ἀπορία* number one leads up to it by facing and disposing of an assumption without which the prohibition of suicide requires some justification.

In favour of this interpretation it may be noted that it makes it possible to combine the backward reference of *τοῦτο* (surely the more ordinary usage) to the rule against suicide, with the right interpretation of *ἀπλοῦν*, so admirably illustrated by Professor Burnet. A 'uniform' rule is so just because it 'does not recognise distinctions.' Professor Burnet objects that 'no one has suggested that the lawlessness of suicide is the only rule which is absolute, and the suggestion would be absurd.' But surely it is thoroughly in accordance with Platonic (or Socratic) principles to assume that *every* rule of conduct depends on choice of the best, and therefore no particular rule of conduct can be 'absolute' because human conduct is not immediately concerned with absolute 'good,' but only with partial and variable 'goods.' (Cf. *Rep.* I. 331 E f., and *Xen. Mem.* IV. 2.17 f.). Even the defence of *μὴ θεμιτὸν εἶναι αὐτὸν εἶναι αὐτὸν ἀποκτινύναι* as an absolute rule is obviously not very seriously intended. According to the interpretation here submitted, the difficulty of the passage is mainly due to the tacit assumption of the familiar principle—that right conduct means choice of the better.

Further, is not some violence to the simple sense, as suggested by the order of the words, involved in taking the dative *τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ* with *βέλτιον*, as Professor Burnet takes it, and separating it from *τυγχάνει*, its natural companion? In a passage so colloquial as this, a little freedom of usage is to be expected. Why should not *βέλτιον*

τεθνάναι ἢ ζῆν stand loosely as subject to τυγχάνει? It would then be a substantive phrase with the infinitive without article, very like καὶ θεοὺς μὴ νομίζειν, καὶ τὸν ἦντω λόγον κρείττω ποιεῖν of Apol. 23D.

MARGARET E. J. TAYLOR.

Royal Holloway College, Englefield Green.

ΑΓΩΝΙΑ (AGONY).

'Αγωνία (of the mind), agony, anguish.' So Liddell and Scott. But owing to the association of the English word 'agony' with extreme pain (as in death-agony, etc.), it should not be used to render the Greek ἀγωνία, which still in the modern language has its proper meaning 'anxiety.' It has no other meaning, but is the proper rendering of English 'anxiety,' or French 'inquiétude.' φόβος ἐπὶ ἀδήλου πράγματος is the Stoic definition. It is, of course, originally the anxiety of a runner in a race before the start. At the same time anxiety, like too many other words, has lost its force in English (e.g., I am anxious to know if — etc.), so it could not in all cases at least be used to translate ἀγωνία; we would have to say 'acute anxiety,' or something similar. I really do not know what would be the best substitute for 'agony' in Luke xxii. 44, but I am sure to nine persons out of ten the word there conveys the wrong notion, owing to its association with acute and paralysing physical or mental pain. That which Christ suffered was exactly φόβος ἐπὶ ἀδήλου πράγματος, as He did not know how His prayer would be answered. It is interesting to note that Theophrastus notes sweat (of the feet at least) to be a physical accompaniment of ἀγωνία in its strict sense of the anxiety of the starters in a race; and Luke no doubt described here a physical symptom he had met with in his practice as a physician. Attention has doubtless been called to this elsewhere (I think by Harnack). It would be well if some other word could be found for ἀγωνία here, as the fact of its involving doubt is, of course, christologically important, and 'agony' effectually veils that from anyone who does

not know that it is used in the proper Greek sense—as e.g. in the English 'an agony of expectation,' or other phrases, which most people no doubt take to be derived from the meaning of agony as equivalent to acutest pain. There are doubtless many preachers who have talked of the 'agony on the Cross,' and the 'agony in Gethsemane' in the same breath, but in the former case there was no ἀγωνία in the strict Greek sense. The cup had been drunk; the race had been run.

In conclusion, I would suggest that in a future edition of Liddell and Scott, the Stoic definitions of virtues, vices, emotions, etc., should be inserted. They are an admirable record of the nuances of usage in the period of the early Stoa.

W. R. PATON.

Vathy, Samos, Greece.

ΜΕΤΕΩΡΟΘΗΡΟΣ.

Μετεωρόθηρος, ὁ, one that hunts high in the air, epith. of a hawk, Arist. H.A., 9.36.3: metaph. of philosophers, Philo, l. 674.

So Liddell and Scott (8th edition.). It is true that in Aristotle l.c. both Pacius (1597) and Bekker (1837), and other editors presumably, have τὸν μετεωροθήρων, but in Philo l.c. μετεωροθήραις is the reading of Turnebus (1640), Pfeiffer (1792), Richter (1828), and finally of Wendland (1898), who reports no variant. The obvious inference that in Aristotle we should read μετεωροθήρων is supported by the citation of Scapula, s.v. θήρ, 'μετεωροθήραι, q.d. in sublimi venantes. avium genus ita dictum quod praedam in sublimi petant. Aristot. de anim. lib. 9.'

HERBERT W. GREENE.

4, Stone Buildings, Lincoln's Inn, W.C.

HORACE, CARMINA, IV. 10. 2.

O crudelis adhuc et Veneris muneribus potens, Insuperata tuae cum veniet †pluma superbiae, etc.

WHY adhuc? Obviously we are meant to recall the previous allusion to Ligurinus in IV. 1. 33-40; and there he is

running a race with Horace and beating him.

Nocturnis ego somniis
Iam captum teneo, iam volucrem sequor
Te per gramina Martii
Campi, te per aquas, dure, volubiles.

I submit that Horace returns for a moment to the same metaphor here. Ligurinus is still leading and stands to win; but when in the pride of victory¹ he has received the palm², he will find it very different from what he had expected,—'insperatum et necopinatum malum.'

¹ *Carm.* III. 30. 14. Sume superbiam | quae sitam meritis.

² Cf. *Carm.* I. 1. 5-6; III. 20. 12; IV. 2. 17-18; and for 'veniet palma,' Stat., *S.* IV. 3. 110. Eoae citius venite laurus.

Insuperata tuae cum veniet palma superbiae
Et, quae nunc umeris involitant, deciderint
comae, etc.

Anything would be better than 'pluma,' and Withof's 'poena' may be right.³ But note how, with the admission of palma, the words 'Veneris muneribus potens' gain in point and meaning. They suggest (whimsically enough) that Ligurinus, like Hippomenes, owes his victory in the race to the favour of Venus,—καλ' ἐν χειρὶν ἑλάνδρον δρόμον ἄνυσεν.

D. A. SLATER.

Llanishen, Cardiff.

³ The ἀπρόσπτον πῆμα of Aeschylus, *P.V.* 107 κ; see also line 680.

REVIEWS

CATALOGUE OF THE ACROPOLIS MUSEUM.

Catalogue of the Acropolis Museum. Vol. I. Archaic Sculpture. By GUY DICKINS, M.A. Cambridge University Press, 1912.

THE British School at Athens and Mr. Dickins are to be congratulated upon this catalogue, which will prove very useful not only to all visitors to Athens but also to all students of early sculpture. The Acropolis Museum contains by far the most complete and interesting series of early sculptures that has come down to us. These have been the subject of a scattered and voluminous literature, from the first accounts of various writers at the time of their discovery to the elaborate descriptions and discussions of M. Lechat and the more recent and brilliant studies of Professor Heberdey and Professor Schrader. A catalogue which should gather together the results of all this various work was much needed; but Mr. Dickins has given us more than this; for his descriptions and criticism are in every case based on a careful first-hand study of the originals, and are very full and accurate. They are greatly helped by the illustrations, which give

an adequate though unambitious reproduction of every statue and fragment described. The reproductions are not made by a photographic process, but are from pen-and-ink drawings made by Mr. Dudley Forsyth with the help of photographs. The drawings are very clever, and serve to recall the various objects to the minds of those who are familiar with them. They naturally cannot serve to give a clear notion of the style, especially of the finer work; but they suffice for identification of large photographs, such as can in most cases be obtained. One wishes for larger photographic reproductions, but such would doubtless have added unduly to the size and expense of the volume.

Another most useful feature is the introduction, which gathers together in a consecutive form the author's views as to the relation and dates of the various sculptures instead of leaving these to be gathered from the individual descriptions. It thus practically amounts to a summary history of early Attic art; and though it was not to be expected that all the problems in this history would be solved, they are stated in an

extremely clear and judicious manner. Mr. Dickins is undoubtedly right in rejecting M. Lechat's too rigorous and mechanical classification by material and style, though that classification has served its purpose for a time. The poros and marble sculptures must be taken as a whole, not as two distinct series; and the question of Attic work and Ionic or Chiot influence is an extremely difficult and complicated one; the two can doubtless be distinguished, but probably no two authorities would draw the line between them at the same place; and it is also very difficult to distinguish between a foreign import and a local work made under foreign influence. Mr. Dickins's conclusions seem on the whole very sound, and he is to be commended for stating them very clearly, wherever possible in a tabular form, and not evading difficult or doubtful points. If, in the following remarks, more stress is laid on matters where I disagree with him than on those as to which I accept his judgment, this must not be taken to imply any disparagement of the usefulness of his work or its general accuracy, which I have been able to test by going through all his descriptions in the museum itself.

The first series as to which I feel some doubt is the set of apparently primitive statues of the 'xoanon' type, mostly in Pentelic marble, which Mr. Dickins therefore asserts to have been in use even earlier than Hymettian; he even attributes them to the seventh century. That the type is a very early one must of course be admitted; but it may be doubted whether any of the extant examples go back to so primitive an age. In the case of 679, the well-known female figure of xoanon shape, it is often asserted that we see a more or less archaistic survival; Mr. Dickins thinks it 'genuinely archaic,' and belonging 'to the primitive Attic school. It comes just at the period when Ionic influence is beginning to penetrate.' But, if so, it is contemporary with the earlier examples of Ionic work; and the others of Mr. Dickins's early class are merely worse or more careless in workmanship, but not therefore necessarily earlier in date, as he himself points

out in criticising M. Lechat's classification. Mr. Dickins himself regards the 'Introduction' pediment, No. 9, as the forerunner of the marble Korai, Nos. 593 and 679, and yet dates it about the middle of the sixth century. This leaves only 582, 583, and 589 for the seventh century class. Of these, 589 is of island marble; 582, though primitive in shape, shows in the feet and the drapery just above them the work of a comparatively advanced period: and 583, though bad and careless, has very bold and freely cut folds in the veil hanging down the back. It would be wiser therefore to regard all of these as reproductions of a primitive type, possibly of an early image, made themselves at no very early time. And with them disappears all evidence for Attic marble work earlier than the poros sculptures, or than the 'moschophoros,' whom Mr. Dickins rightly compares with the three-bodied monster.

In view of the many restorations and combinations that have been proposed for the poros pediments, Mr. Dickins wisely does not dogmatize, but appends to his description of the various component parts a brief account of the various systems on which they have been grouped together. He gives Professor Heberdey's arrangement as the last and at present the most probable; but one cannot hope that it has attained finality. It seems, however, pretty clear at last that the three-bodied monster and the Triton belong to one pediment of the old temple of Athena, and the two large snakes to the other, though what came between them is still uncertain. The group of seated gods appears to have found its proper place as part of the 'Presentation of Heracles' pediment, which has also annexed the small poros Heracles and 'Amazon' or Iris, and has a possible claim on some other extant figures. In the case of the 'Erechtheum' pediment, justice is hardly done to Professor Heberdey's placing of the 'Hydriophore' three-quarter-face, to the right of the building. The finish of the figure implies such a position; and the large leaden dowel in the roof evidently held the object on the figure's head, which had given way under the strain and was fixed with dowels to the shoulders.

It is above all in connection with the famous series of marble Korai or Maidens that the most difficult problems occur. All authorities are agreed in seeing in them a foreign influence, but the exact extent of this influence, where it came from, and the means whereby it was exercised, are all to some extent uncertain. It comes in with the use of island marble, especially from Paros and Naxos, and is evidently very different from the heavy 'lax' Ionic which we find at Branchidae and in Lycia. Mr. Dickins accepts with 'no hesitation' the common opinion that it is Chiote or N. Ionic; but he admits, as everyone must, that the evidence for this is very scanty. The face and drapery of the Nike of Archermos are by no means identical in style with those of the Acropolis statues; and if the identification of that statue be disputed, we have no direct evidence as to Chiote style. Again, he inclines to the opinion that the most distinctive examples of the new style were 'made in Chios and imported.' There seems very little evidence in favour of such a view; the marble of which they are made comes from Naxos or Paros; and artists from many other cities are known from inscriptions to have been working in Athens. In view of a certain homogeneity which we can recognize in the

whole Athenian series, with two or three clear exceptions, it seems more probable that they are the work of a set of artists of various origin and traditions, some of them possibly Chiote, some of them certainly Athenian, whose styles acted and reacted on one another, and culminated in the mixed character of some of the finest works just before the Persian wars. To discuss this and other matters adequately would require not a review, but a treatise on early Attic art. Two or three oversights in detail may be noted for correction in a future edition. The building-stone from Lycabettos used in modern Athens is not breccia (p. 35), but blue limestone like the Acropolis rock. The length of the feet of the two crouching figures, Nos. 160 and 168, is identical, both '14, and not '14 and '16 as stated; this is of the more importance, since the difference is made a reason for separating them; they must almost certainly belong together. The expression 'stomach muscles,' which occurs several times, seems an unfortunate substitute for 'abdominal muscles.' In many other cases there is room for differences of opinion; but none for doubting the care and thoroughness of Mr. Dickins's work.

E. A. GARDNER.

University College, London.

FOUR STAGES OF GREEK RELIGION.

Four Stages of Greek Religion. By GILBERT MURRAY. 8vo. Pp. 224. Henry Frowde, Oxford University Press, for the Columbia University Press, 1912. 6s. net.

THIS book treats of Pre-Olympian religion (pp. 15-53), of the Origin of the Olympians (pp. 57-77), and of their religious value (pp. 78-99), of the decadence or 'the lower country lying between . . . Greek Philosophy and Christianity' (pp. 103-154), of Julian's revival (very lightly sketched), and of Sallustius (pp. 157-184). The rather dreary treatise *περὶ Θεῶν καὶ Κόσμου* is described as 'an authoritative statement of doctrine' for the last phase

of paganism, and is translated in an Appendix (pp. 187-214). Since Mr. Murray aims largely at the filling up of interstices, and avoids the great illuminated places, his book is to be recommended only to readers who already know something of Greek religion on its higher side.

As to Pre-Olympian religion and the 'making' of the Olympians, Mr. Murray warns us that he is giving 'a personal impression of a subject which is showing new facets every year.' An even clearer warning might have been given that the hypotheses which are here so skilfully woven into a persuasive vision are themselves spun out of hypotheses. The study of primitive religion has the

characteristics ascribed by Mr. Murray (p. 18) to religion itself. It deals with the uncharted, and is apt to reach its conclusions by means of 'emotion and sub-conscious apprehension': and when once the things of the uncharted region are admitted, they are apt to swamp all others. Here is an example. Our evidence about the idea of God among savages is, we are reminded, contradictory. Some say the Arunta tribes have no conception of God: some say they are always thinking about God. This is interesting, but the author suggests that such facts as this throw light on Buddhism, on Parmenides, on the vague use of *θεός* in Tragedy. Did Euripides really say *ὁ νοῦς γὰρ ἡμῶν ἐστὶν ἐν ἐκάστῳ θεός* because his remote ancestors had vague notions of Divinity? If so, what of our very definite primitive *θε(σ)ός*, the medicine-king? The author may very properly reply that in a popular lecture it is impossible to produce one's proof. The fact remains that, on such a subject, the statement of the conclusions without the proofs is misleading. Miss Harrison, for instance, brilliantly interpreting the third-century hymn of the Kouretes by means of the prehistoric Hagia Triada sarcophagus, conducts an argument of which every step is controversial, but which is valuable, because she adduces her evidence as she proceeds. It is a different matter when her conclusions are thus announced: 'The dance of the *Kouroi*, or initiate youths, in the dithyramb . . . projected the Megistos Kouros, the greatest of youths, who is the incarnation of spring. . . . The Kouros appears as Dionysus, as Apollo, as Hermes, as Ares: in our clearest and most detailed piece of evidence he actually appears with the characteristic history and attributes of Zeus.' Who could guess that the Palaikastro hymn is our only evidence for the title Megistos Kouros? That the connection with the dithyramb and Dionysus is an inference based on an interpretation of the pre-historic Cretan cults with which Mr. Murray (p. 85 n.) modestly says that he is 'incompetent to deal'? Or that the word 'projected' implies a psychology which was

imagined primarily to explain not Greek but savage customs? It should be added that some new conjectures are provided to serve as ornament for our palace of hypothesis: at the Anthesteria the ghosts come back to the world in order, we are told, that they may be present, and may get new life, at the marriage of the Basilissa with Dionysus. In these important matters great service has been done by Miss Harrison, Dieterich, and others (Professor Murray himself among them), who have laboured to rouse us from lethargy by calling attention to the evidence. The inferences are not yet certain. The evidence itself is not yet adequately analysed and sorted. Even the principles of analysis are not yet matter of general agreement. If the results are, in spite of that, ready for a popular treatment, no one is better qualified by imaginative sympathy, wide reading, power of exposition, than is Professor Murray. But at present, it seems to me, criticism ought to be the work, not popularisation.

With regard to the Olympian gods we are on safer ground. Here the author makes a welcome protest against the somewhat disparaging language of some students of their origin. There are signs that he is himself so much in sympathy with Euripides and Marcus Aurelius, and even less pagan-minded persons, that he is at times a little inclined to find Olympus shocking. But he does his best for it, and makes a good, if not whole-hearted, defence. His chapter on the Hellenistic period is the longest, and, in my opinion, the most interesting. Here we are given popularisation of the best kind. The guide is safe: the country is happily not uncharted. It is however a difficult country, and Professor Murray does a real service to the traveller. We feel that his intellectual virtue condemns much of the religion that he is describing: he describes it so well because his intellectual virtue has an antagonist in his heart.

J. T. SHEPPARD.

King's College, Cambridge.

AGNOSTOS THEOS.

Agnostos Theos, Untersuchungen zur Formengeschichte religiöser Rede. E. NORDEN. Demy 8vo. 1 vol. Pp. ix+410. Leipzig: Teubner, 1913. M. 12; bound, M. 13.

MUCH of the progress in New Testament criticism during recent years has been due to scholars who have made their reputation in other fields of learning. In the present volume Norden, the learned author of *Die antike Kunstprosa*, following in Blass' footsteps, has studied the Acts of the Apostles from the standpoint of a classical philologist and produced a work of remarkable interest and originality.

As the title indicates, the investigation starts from St. Paul's speech at Athens and the altar-inscription *ἀγνώστῳ θεῷ*. Norden tries to show that the speech conforms to a fixed type of Jewish-Christian missionary preaching, which can be traced back to old Greek prophetic addresses, but owed its special characteristics to later Hellenism as modified by Oriental and Jewish influences. By the side of this *Grundmotiv* of the speech there is a Stoic *Begleitmotiv*, which appears in such expressions as οὐδὲ ὑπὸ χειρῶν ἀνθρωπίνων θεραπεύεται προσδεόμενός τινος, ζητεῖν τὸν θεὸν εἰ ἄρα γε ψηλαφήσειαν αὐτὸν καὶ εὐροίεν, and others. In the famous sentence ἐν αὐτῷ γὰρ ζῶμεν καὶ κινούμεθα καὶ ἐσμέν each of the verbs can be paralleled from Stoic sources, though the author of Acts was the first to combine them into a solemn formula. For *κινεῖσθαι* in the sense of movements of the soul the words that Lucan puts into Cato's mouth are quoted: Iuppiter est quodcunque vides, quodcunque moveris (IX. 580). But in the parallels adduced God is represented as *ἀόρατος*, *ἀθεώρητος*, *ἀφανής*, *ἀκατάληπτος*; why did the author substitute *ἀγνώστος θεός* for these expressions?

This brings Norden to the most controversial stage of his argument. Not only the speech, but also the whole situation out of which it arises is said to be composed from traditional material. To praise Athens for piety was a *locus communis* (cf. Apuleius, *flor.* 1). But the

actual source of the section in Acts was the story of the visit of Apollonius of Tyana to Athens. Apollonius visited Athens, noted the piety of the inhabitants and wrote a little book on the subject, in which he criticised the Eleusinian hierophant who had refused to initiate him into the mysteries (Philostratus, IV. 18, 19). A quotation from this *διάλεξις περὶ θυσίων* is preserved in Eusebius, *praef. ev.* IV. 13, which contains a polemic against idolatry agreeing with that which Philostratus puts into Apollonius' mouth during his visit to Egypt (VI. 19, cf. VI. 3, where Apollonius refers to *βαρμολὶ ἀγνώστων δαιμόνων* at Athens). Norden concludes that the author of Acts used a report of Apollonius' visit to Athens as a model for his own narrative, and changed the plural of the inscription *ἀγνώστων θεῶν* into the singular, which suited his purpose better (Jerome had already given this explanation).

So bold a theory demands searching criticism, which indeed Harnack has already given in his *Ist die Rede des Paulus in Athen ein ursprünglicher Bestandteil der Apostelgeschichte?* (*Texte und Untersuchungen* XXXIX. 1.) The reader has only to look up the passages of Philostratus for himself to see how slight is the resemblance to Acts xvii.; and, even were the resemblance much closer, 'Damis' is a very shadowy person and the possibility of a hypothetical source of Philostratus having been used by the final editor of the Acts is a weak foundation for so radical a reconstruction.

Norden's theory of the composition of Acts must now be considered. He supposes the existence of a Redactor, who used a source written in both first and third persons, and whose own activity was evinced chiefly in the composition of speeches (p. 315). The Areopagus-speech will then have been composed by this Redactor about 100 A.D. In thus distinguishing between the Redactor and the author of the bulk of the narrative Norden takes the work of earlier scholars as an assured result and only mentions Harnack's studies in order to disagree with them. But the lin-

guistic arguments in favour of the unity of Acts are very strong; the speeches are probably Luke's own free compositions; even the Areopagus speech contains nothing that would have been beyond the reach of an educated Gentile Christian in the third quarter of the first century. The only thing that would have commended Norden's theory is absent, namely, an investigation showing a difference between the speeches and narrative of Acts in respect of language.

We believe then that on these two points, Apollonius and the composition of Acts, Norden's conclusions are erroneous. With all his wealth of illustrative material he has neglected the careful linguistic study of the text of Acts on which so much depends.

It is a pleasure to point to the brilliant investigations in the second half of the book, dealing with the forms of prayer used in Greek, Jewish and Christian religious circles, and showing the exist-

ence of fixed types of religious utterance. More ingenious than convincing is a dissertation on St. Matthew xi. 25-30, which reaches the result that the author of Q (the Gospel-source formerly called 'Logia') used a 'mystic-theosophic tractate, which had already had a long past and, at least in Oriental languages, received a fixed literary expression' (p. 307).

The above account is fragmentary, but corresponds with the book itself, which is a series of separate treatises and appendices loosely strung together. Its value consists in its astonishing learning, exact scholarship and wealth of illustrative material rather than in any assured results. But even where the conclusions seem erroneous, the theologian will find that Professor Norden throws a flood of welcome light on the New Testament.

W. K. LOWTHER CLARKE.

Cavendish Rectory, Suffolk.

THE APOSTOLIC FATHERS.

The Loeb Classical Library. Edited by T. E. PAGE, M.A. and W. H. D. ROUSE, Litt. D. *The Apostolic Fathers*, Kirsopp Lake. 2 vols. viii + 409, 396. London: Heinemann, 1912, 1913.

TRANSLATIONS of the *Apostolic Fathers* already exist in the Ante-Nicene Christian Library (1867) and in the admirable edition of Lightfoot and Harmer (1891 and subsequent reprints). In some respects therefore the way has been made smooth for the translator, but the task of producing an independent work has been correspondingly difficult. Professor Lake has given us an admirable rendering in terse, modern English of these important writings, and his edition is by far the best for the non-specialist reader that has yet appeared. In some cases his method entails sacrifices, as when he translates the second person singular and plural alike by 'you,' and thereby blurs some important distinctions of the original; but the gain is more than the loss. Professor Lake's

repute as a textual critic guarantees the excellence of the Greek text, and the few notes that are allowed by the plan of the series make the reader desire further guidance from so competent a scholar.

There are a few slips in the translation. On pp. 149, 203 of the first volume *διὰ παντός* is rendered 'every way,' 'in everything,' instead of 'continually.' In the second volume *ἐλκομένους* is rendered 'which had been dragged' (p. 31), *τοῦ κυρίου* 'God' (p. 49), *ἀμαρτίαν* 'shame' (p. 119), *ἡ πύλη ἐστὶν ὡς ἡλιος* 'glistened in the sun' (p. 221). On p. 89 *εἰς κεράμιον μέλιτος ἐπιχέειν* hardly means 'pour into it a jar of honey'; on p. 99 'covetousness' demands *πλεονεξία* in the text in place of *πλεονεξιών*; on p. 129 *ἀλήθειαν* is left untranslated. No doubt there is a good reason for rendering *ἀπόκενος* 'half-empty,' but the meaning usually given is 'quite empty,' which suits the context better (p. 135). After Dean Robinson's discussions in his commentary on Ephesians it seems better not to trans-

late ἐπίγνωσις by 'complete knowledge' (p. 371), and to take πεπωρωμένην as 'blinded' rather than 'hardened' (p. 133). In the first volume in δι' αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ, ὃν τινες ἀρνοῦνται the relative refers more naturally to θανάτου in view of the Docetic background of the Ignatian epistles (p. 205), and the interesting alternative rendering of ὁ ἑμὸς

ἔρως ἐσταύρωται, 'My love has been crucified,' might have been mentioned (p. 235). There is a sprinkling of misprints, especially in the *Shepherd of Hermas*, which might be corrected in a second edition.

W. K. LOWTHER CLARKE.

Cavendish Rectory, Suffolk.

PROFESSOR EARLE'S CLASSICAL PAPERS.

The Classical Papers of M. L. Earle, with a Memoir. Pp. xxix + 298. 9" x 6". Columbia University Press and London: H. FROWDE, 1912. 12s. 6d.

THE collected papers of the late Professor Earle, whose premature death was a heavy loss to American scholarship, show him to have been a man of great diligence, wide reading, varied interests and remarkable versatility. The variety of his interests is shown by the contents of this volume, which includes not only critical articles on numerous Latin and Greek authors, but papers on syntax, inscriptions and ancient statuary; and we must admire the versatility of one who is equally capable of so admirable a 'fair copy' as the Greek translation of Lincoln's *Gettysburg Address*, a poem in Modern Greek and reviews in French. The book is preceded by a biography written by his friend, the late Professor Ashmore, which contains some clearly drawn appreciations of its subject, but would have been better for more restraint in its panegyric. It is irritating to be asked to admire his 'sanity and penetration' because of such sayings as those quoted on p. 22, e.g. 'Remember that the ancients commonly used long sentences where we use short, choppy ones.' Nor can we regard as 'crumbs from the rich man's table' notes such as 'I must re-read Cicero,' or 'Ernesti's *Clavis* to be used.' Lazarus could not be fed on the memoranda for Dives' future menus. It is always difficult to criticise the collected posthumous writings of a scholar: one feels that a writer of fastidious taste, if himself called upon to under-

take the production of the works and *πάρεργα* of nearly twenty years, with respect to many of them 'aut mutaret aut non daret, aut, si dedisset, non istas res in actis suis duceret.' Sometimes Professor Earle has announced his withdrawal of views put out by himself, as in *Hor. Od.* I. i. 36., where in two articles which appeared in this *Review* in 1902 and 1904 he suggests and withdraws the reading *sublimis*. Probably others of his emendations would have been withdrawn on reflection; for it has to be admitted that, ingenious though many of his emendations are, they often seem to be quite unnecessary, and in some cases to produce a worse sense or rhythm than the text. He too often seems to act upon the motto of his University which is printed outside the volume: *In Litteris Libertas*. He is particularly fond, also, without sufficient warrant, of altering the order of the lines. His rearrangement of the watchman's speech in the *Agamemnon* (p. 88), does not carry conviction, and his alteration of the order of lines in *Hor. Sat.* I. i. 80-91, for which the only apology is 'multo melius mea quidem opinione se habebunt' excites protest by its separation of lines 83 and 84. An ingenious emendation, which is ably defended, is *παῖμ' ἐπὶ παίματι κείται* for *πῆμ' ἐπὶ πῆματι* in *Herod.* i. 67. This, like many other of his notes, appeared in the *Classical Review*. But there is little warrant for such emendations as *λυπρὸς* for *λαμπρὸς* in *Eur. Heracl.* 280 (p. 110), *ἡδέως* for *ἡλιον* in *Eur. Phoen.* 504 (p. 118), where he does not see the reference to 'planets'; or *προηγγητήρ λόγων* for *προφήτης σοι λόγων* in *Eur. Bacch.* 211 (p. 107), where the caesura

has to be sacrificed. A worse illustration of the method of emendation which corrects a classical author's writings like a schoolboy's verses is to be found on p. 185, where, on *Hor. Sat. I. vi. 44*, 'cornua quod vincatque tubas,' he says: 'neither Heindorf nor anyone else, so far as I know, has observed that *tubas* is needless after *cornua*, and that nothing is said in the apodosis of the sentence about the noise of the waggons. I would read "cornua quod vincatque *rotas*." It is hardly necessary to remark that this reading introduces a very neat chiasmus.' But we are

scarcely entitled to substitute words for others which very slightly resemble them in order to improve the passage with a chiasmus, and besides *cornua* and *tubae* go constantly together (e.g. *Cic. Sull. v. 17. Tac. Ann. i. 68, ii. 81*). Why is it needless to have two different kinds of instrument in a band? The book, however, is full of good things, and an interesting memorial of one who must have been a scholarly and stimulating teacher.

A. S. OWEN.

Keble College, Oxford.

PROFESSOR HARRY'S STUDIES IN SOPHOCLES.

Studies in Sophocles. By J. E. HARRY. Vol. 7, No. 3. 9" x 6". Pp. 46. Cincinnati: University Press, 1912. 50 cents.

ANOTHER American scholar, Professor J. E. Harry, of Cincinnati, is responsible for this small brochure. Among its longer sections it contains an article to prove that *El. 568* means: 'with a boast about the slaughter of which he shot and hit,' where the uses of *σφαγή* are well marshalled; another which makes Ismene responsible for the first burial of Polynices, in which little is added to the ingenious article of Dr. Rouse in the *Classical Review* of March, 1911; and a long discussion of *Ajax 143*, in which *ἵπομανῆ* is suggested for *ἵππομανῆ*. Of the emendations the best is probably *O.T. 1089*, where Professor Harry reads *ἀπείργων* for *ἀπείρων*,

making *τὰν αὔριον πανσέληνον* the subject of *αὔξειν*; but some of the others are unconvincing and unsatisfactory, none more so than his suggestion in *El. 1468*, to read *ὦ Ζεῦ, δέδορκα φάσμι' ἂν' εὖ φανούμενον*, followed by the translation of the next line as: 'but whether retribution brought about that fall I do not undertake to say.' A note on the Sophoclean use of tmesis contains a string of wrong references, after which we are told that 'Aegisthus is fond of separating *ἀνὰ* from its belongings by inserting some particle or adverb.' This is a curious trait of character to have added to murder and adultery! Did Electra refer to this irritating propensity, when she called him *ὁ πάντ' ἀναλκίς οὗτος*?

A. S. OWEN.

Keble College, Oxford.

A NEW HORACE.

Q. Horati Flacci Opera. Oeuvres d'Horace Texte latin, avec un Commentaire critique et explicatif des Introductions et des Tables, par F. PLESSIS et P. LEJAY.

Q. Horati Flacci Satirae. Satires, publiées par PAUL LEJAY. Pp. 623. Paris: Hachette et Cie., 1911. 15 frs.

IT is claimed for the work of which this fine volume will form the second

part, that it will be the first complete French Horace, with detailed criticism and interpretation, since that of Dacier (1681). Effective scholarship knows no nationality; yet we may be allowed to express a feeling that the countrymen of Turnebus and Lambin ought to have a full-scale edition of the poet, whose spirit their current literature so gracefully absorbs. M. Lejay's handling of the *Satires*, by its thoroughness, judg-

ment, and temper, leads us to hope that the want is being supplied.

Thoroughness is the keynote of this edition, even to the exclusion of individuality. Some self-repression is good, but we are glad that M. Lejay has not quite succeeded in effacing himself. The whole of Horatian literature seems to have come under his eye, much of it being stored in the volumes of the *Classical Review* and other periodicals. The English editions have been carefully used and such writings as those of Sellar and H. Nettleship. Of the latter's paper on *The Roman Satura* it is remarked that after more than thirty years it shows its age but little (p. cviii, n. 5). The editor never fails to give us his own distinct and reasoned opinion on every topic raised; and this is a great merit. He is well aware of the danger of an excessive study of a poet's 'atmosphere, the slow historical preparations out of which maturity is to come' (p. cviii).

The plan claimed as distinctive is to discuss very fully all questions showing Horace's environment, in a General Introduction and also in special introductions to the several *Satires*. These introductions contain much which is usually found in a commentary. Thus the difficult last line of II. 1 ('Solventur risu tabulae, etc.') is admirably discussed in three full pages (289-292). In the earlier pages legal points are considered, not for their antiquarian interest, but as bearing on the poem. Here a novel point, unknown at least to Mommsen, is made. Horace and Cicero were both wrong in their reading of the enactment (Tab. VIII.) of the XII. Tables supposed to make libel a criminal offence. It really referred to witchcraft. We are referred to Huvelin (*Mélanges* Appleton, Lyon 1903, p. 371 *suiv.*).

The text follows, with separate critical and explanatory commentaries, both in French. There are no Excursus or Appendices. A full Index will doubtless be provided in the completed work. In his notes M. Lejay never translates. 'Do not translate: translation is the death of understanding,' was a paradox of Moritz Haupt's reported by H. Nettleship. Haupt had

the riper student in view, and the present edition is intended for teachers, not for young students, and assumes ripeness of knowledge and interest.

The General Introduction deals with two currents of thought which converged in Roman Satire; Philosophy, as applied to life, and dramatic instinct, native or exotic. The treatment of philosophy bodes well for the *Epistles*, which are also in M. Lejay's hands. Horace had little taste for the Cynicism, which was superseding the Stoic system of Panaetius and Posidonius, known to Cicero. He never spares its professors. Yet, in its protest against fashionable excesses, it had much in harmony with his self-taught creed of the *Via Media*, of balance and self-possession, of variety and interchange of contraries 'with an inclination to the more benign extreme.' Epicureanism serves as a good stick to belabour the Cynics, as in the first three *Satires* of Book I. The humanity of its general outlook is that of Horace, with a difference. The thought of death, so prominent in the *Odes*, is noted as simply absent. (Yet the town mouse, with his tiny Lucretian counsels, should not be ignored.) Nor is Horace to be ranked among academic doubters. For all his irony and seeming indifference, he always sees his own view clear, and he cares. We are grateful to M. Lejay for bringing this out. No one will teach us much about Horace who stops short at his gaiety and good temper and light hand in verse.

The dramatic antecedents of Roman Satire are dealt with very fully. Much stress is laid on the influence of the Old Attic Comedy upon Lucilius and Horace, not only in its spirit, which we all recognise, but in its forms. Thus the Prologue of, say, the *Wasps*, with its preliminary burlesque skirmish ('parade'), followed by the patter ('boniment') of Sosias, finds its counterpart in several *Satires* (as II. 7). This point, like many others in this volume, should receive careful consideration. We can only remark that the argument rests on two rather obscure factors, the form of the Lucilian Satire, and the contents of the assumed Second Book of Aristotle's *Poetics*, known to Horace through

current manuals (of which we shall no doubt hear more on the *Ars Poetica*).

The Latin antecedents of Satire are treated with much fulness, and we hear perhaps something too much of current controversy and of the names of eminent living scholars, when we should be satisfied to have M. Lejay's conclusion on the texts of Varro and Livy. We may hope that his edition will be in use when the discussions of our own day are as dead as the wars of the Daciers. There are indications that M. Lejay to some extent shares impatience.

We can only speak summarily on textual matters, full information being reserved for Vol. I. There is some positive advantage in dealing with the *Satires* alone, but here two important MSS., B and D are in large part absent, as is shown in a useful table. The MSS. are divided into two classes, falling into three and four groups respectively. Speaking broadly, the new First Class includes the First and Second of Keller and Hodder; and B and V now appear in the First Division of the First Class. This is, so far, very satisfactory.

Interesting readings are I. 1. 108, where we have 'qui nemo' from V and I. 6. 128 'campum lusumque trigonem' (M. Lejay, in a clear, critical note, disposes of the hard attempt of K and H to deduce the reading of g, and so of V, from 'rabiosi tempora signi'). On the latter passage, should we not hear something of Bentley's name, beyond a mention of his conjecture 'nudum'? In the century and a quarter between Cruquius and Bentley, no one had utilised the readings of V; and we owe it to the driving power of Bentley's pen, and perhaps to his note on this passage, that we are now welcoming V into a First Class.

In II. 7. 13 we have 'doctor' for 'doctus' of K and H. Here Wickham hesitates, as Bentley had done, and prints 'doctus.' Schütz hesitates, and prints *doctus*. Dillenburger prints 'doctor.' M. Lejay (p. cxxv) begs that 'doctor' may have the benefit of the doubt, and in fact prints it. (If 'doctor' stands, may it be taken to help 'Corrector Bestius,' Lambinus' conjecture in *Ep.* I. 15. 37.) M. Lejay has in

general abstained from new conjectures. That offered on II. 1. 16 ('tu' for 'et'), with a variation by his colleague, is perhaps needless.

The scale and nature of the Commentary can best be shown by a complete example. On II. 3. 313 the critical note justifies 'Tantum' at the beginning of the line. The explanatory note runs:

'313. *Tantum* = *tam* cf. 317. *Tanto* est ordinairement rattaché à *minorem*, par symétrie avec *tantum dissimilem*. Mais la symétrie n'est pas dans les préoccupations d'Hor. *Tanto* est plutôt un datif construit avec un verbe de lutte, construction qui se trouve déjà chez les auteurs anciens (Plaute, *Bacch.* 967, *Trin.* 838-839), mais que les poètes du siècle d'Auguste ont étendue au point d'en faire un des caractères du langage poétique. Alors *tanto certare* est placé à l'intérieur du deuxième qualificatif du sujet espèce d'*ἀπό κοινοῦ* qui n'est pas plus étrange, que celle de I. 4. 67-8 et de beaucoup d'autres passages. Dans l'interprétation de Bentley, *certare* dépend de *minorem*; cf. Sil. Ital. V. 76: *Heu fatis superi certare minores*.'

The suggestion that *tanto* is a dative is a bold one, and the line gains sense and spirit. Bentley's apt quotation from Silius for the infinitive after *minorem* also justifies the dative, though he himself took *tanto* as ablative. His note should be read with that of M. Lejay.

The notes contain much helpful grammatical matter, as on I. 6. 110 ('*Millibus atque aliis*'). On II. 2. 89 we have:

'*Non quia . . . erat*. Hor. n'y credit pas et constate le fait, d'où l'indic. très regulier, surtout avec *non quia* (Riemann, *Syntaxe*, s. 193, et rem. 3.)'

The reason suggested and dismissed is 'the ancients had no noses.' Surely Horace does not affirm this as a fact. M. Lejay's note shows that the ancients had noses and did not esteem high game, though the opposite extreme was barbarian. M. Riemann seems to state the rule correctly for Cicero (who very rarely uses *non quia* at all), but admits an 'incorrect' use in Lucr. II. 3; Liv. 33. 27. 6. May not Horace, though he

is 'correct'—e.g. in S. I. 6. 1-2—be 'incorrect' for once? Schütz has a good note here, and so has Palmer, who however suspects interpolation of the whole passage.

More important, because affecting punctuation, is II. 8. 6. We are accustomed to read:

In primis Lucanus aper; leni fuit Austro
Captus, ut aiebat cenae pater. . . .

and to feel the archness of the heroic opening. Cf. 'imprimis venerare deos' in contrast with the host's shabby excuse. M. Lejay, following Madvig's suggestion (*Advers.* II. 6), as also Schütz, removes the stop after 'aper.' 'Fuit est le verbe principal (in primis fuit) et leni Austro Captus une détermination circonstancielle.' Is not the change uncalled for, and the resulting construction somewhat insipid? Madvig discusses the matter very fully (*Opusc. Academ.* II. p. 223), with reference to

S. I. 6. 13, and condemns the forms with *fuit* for the best poets, but allows one exception in Propertius, and two or three in Ovid (surely there are more than two or three?). Bentley removed *fuit* from I. 6. 13 because he had a better MS. reading, and because of the prosiness of '*pulsus fuit*': no grammatical impropriety had offended him.

These points cannot be worked out in a short review; they are best stated as queries.

M. Lejay has paid special attention to the development of Horace's epistolary manner out of that of the *Satires* (Introductions to I. 6, and II. 6). We shall look forward with much interest to his edition of the *Epistles*; and as he has material already in hand, perhaps this labour may not require eleven years. Meanwhile, we may hope to welcome the *Odes* from his collaborator, M. Plessis. A. O. P.

JUVENALIS DECLAMANS.

Juvenalis declamans, Étude sur la rhétorique déclamatoire dans les Satires de Juvenal. Par JOSUÉ DE DECKER. (Recueil de Travaux publiés par la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres.) 1 Vol. 8vo. Pp. 206. Gand: Van Goethem, 1913. 9 fr.

THIS admirably written book is an important contribution to the study of Juvenal and incidentally of Roman Rhetoric. M. de Decker starts by accepting the statement of the ancient biography that Juvenal practised declamation till middle life; after which he turned to writing satire. He then proceeds to demonstrate at length the influence of Juvenal's rhetorical studies on his work as a poet. The practise of rhetoric to which Juvenal devoted himself consisted in the public delivery of declamations; the listening to such declamations, no less than to the recitations of poets, formed one of the chief intellectual relaxations of the educated Roman public under the Empire. The elder Seneca has collected many specimens from such declamations delivered by distinguished rhetoricians: these and

the smaller and larger declamations ascribed to Quintilian, as well as Quintilian's own *Institutio oratoria*, constitute the chief sources of our knowledge of imperial rhetoric. M. de Decker has examined analytically the material thus provided from the point of view both of the contents and the form.

A detailed comparison with Juvenal's Satires reveals the same matter and the same style. Though it is the fashion to describe Juvenal as rhetorical, the proof has never yet been set forth thus clearly. Side by side are ranged quotations from the rhetoricians and from Juvenal. The ideas, the style, the very phrases and words are found to correspond. The result is convincing and instructive. As regards matter the rhetoricians dwelt continually on five commonplaces (*loci communes*): the same five commonplaces reappear in Juvenal. Firstly there is the topic of the depravity of the age, expressed in invectives against the vices and crimes of both sexes, and involving, as an antithetical corollary, panegyrics on the simplicity of the great men of the past. Secondly there is the theme of the controlling influence of Chance

(*Fortuna*) and Destiny (*Fatum*) on human life. Thirdly there is the consideration of the evils resulting from the possession of great wealth. Fourthly there is the topic of cruelty, its poisonings, tortures, murders, parricides, the sensational development of which horrors in the hands of the rhetoricians appealed to the popular emotions after the fashion of the modern melodrama. Fifthly there are trite commonplaces of a philosophical tinge, concerning the care exercised by the gods for human affairs, the impossibility of foreseeing the future, the fact that virtue is the sole path to happiness and the guilty conscience the sinner's chief punishment, and that indulgence must be extended to the failings of the young. Detailed quotations prove that these ideas form the basis of the declamations and are prominent in Juvenal's *Satires*. It is thus clear whence the satirist drew his inspiration.

M. de Decker justly remarks that the rhetorical merit of Juvenal lies not in the conception of new ideas but in presenting the traditional material of the rhetoricians in a brilliant setting. At the same time he is careful to point out that there are in Juvenal two natures, that of the rhetorician and that of the poet: sometimes one sometimes the other predominates. For along with all his rhetoric Juvenal is a poet of true feeling, 'il est aussi un poète à l'âme sensible' (p. 50). The beautiful lines in which he expresses his pity for the poor are produced as evidence (iii. 147 ff.). M. de Decker remarks that these have nothing in common with the verbosity of the rhetoricians. Also there are in Juvenal great flashes of delicate feeling and an exquisite sense of picturesque detail. Could genuine poetic freshness and tenderness be better exemplified than in the sketch of the country lad transported to the city who

suspirat longo non visam tempore matrem,
et casulam et notos tristis desiderat haedos?

M. de Decker will learn with surprise that Juvenal has been excluded from the number of the Roman poets in *The Oxford Book of Latin Verse*. A collection which omits the greatest master of style among Roman poets except Virgil is surprising, especially when it is realised that this

master is not deficient in delicacy, picturesqueness and pathos.

From the matter M. de Decker passes to the form of the *Satires*. These, he shows, are not constructed unmethodically, as some critics suppose, but are planned each according to a precise scheme after the manner of the declamations of the rhetoricians. What is noticeable in Juvenal is his love of dwelling upon details: such episodic details are similarly characteristic of the rhetoricians. The long digression formed a normal part of the declamation; in fact the whole was sacrificed to the parts. 'In descriptionibus (says Seneca, *Contr.* II. praef. 1) extra legem omnibus verbis, dummodo niterent, permissa libertas.' This fondness for digression is typical of Juvenal. Irrelevancy mattered little to the rhetorician provided effect was secured. M. de Decker's masterly treatment of this subject should cause critics to pause before (in defiance of manuscript tradition) they condemn lines because of their seeming irrelevancy.

Further, the *Satires*, like the declamations, are addressed to an imaginary audience or auditor. Thus in the *Satires* there is no real dialogue, such as distinguished the early *Satura*, though, as with the rhetoricians, imaginary objections are introduced as a mere means of transition. On the other hand the dramatic character of the original *Satura* survives in Juvenal in the dramatic scenes which he introduces, such as the picture of the rush of clients to the dole, the quarrel with the bully, the deliberations at the council of Domitian. Also the formal statement of the subject (*propositio*); the proof by examples drawn from historical celebrities, which method of ratiocination became, as Seneca says, a perfect malady ('*gravis morbus*,' *Contr.* VII. 5. 12) with the rhetoricians; the method of argument by an ascending scale of instances, e.g., Lateranus, Damasippus, Gracchus (*Sat.* VIII.); the frequent use of antithesis; the very forms of transition, which are feeble and stereotyped in their character, are all shown to be features common to the satirist and the rhetoricians. The same applies to the redundancy of the language, the excess of realism in de-

scriptions, the fondness for *sententiae*, viz. brilliant epigrams inserted to clinch the point, the tautological amplification of the same idea. M. de Decker insists on the importance of recognising that this deliberate affectation of tautology, inherited from the rhetoricians, has left profound traces on Juvenal's Satires, since it invalidates the theories no less of those who would remove redundancies from the text than of those who see in them traces of a double recension.

These are the main contents of this learned and attractive work, a book, which like Dürr's recent essay on the poet's methods of composition sheds much light on that subject. As regards the question of the Oxford fragment in the Sixth Satire, while rejecting Dr. Leo's theory of a double recension as a whole, M. de Decker thinks that divergencies

in the tradition of that satire are practically established: Leo's results on this point are beyond question. But he does not believe in a complete double recension based upon the poet's posthumous revision, and he offers the ingenious suggestion that the Sixth Satire, which forms a Book by itself, appeared originally separately, and that its text underwent certain modifications by the poet himself before it was incorporated into the body of the Satires. The Oxford fragment then may have stood in the first draft, but have been excluded from the complete edition. It found its way into our texts through the survival of an ancient copy of the original draft of the Satire.

S. G. OWEN.

Christ Church, Oxford.

PAULI AEGINETAE LIBRI TERTII INTERPRETATIO LATINA
ANTIQUA ADJUVANTE INSTITUTIO PUSCHMANNIO LIPSIENSI.

Pauli Aeginetae Libri Tertii Interpretatio Latina antiqua adjuvante Institutio Puschmannio Lipsiensi. Edidit J. L. HEIBERG. 12mo. Pp. v-xiv + 1-242. In aed. Teubneri, MCMXII. M. 4.40.

THE best known translator of the later Greek medical authors was Günther of Andernach (1487-1574),¹ an M.D. of Paris, who had studied at Deventer and Marburg; Professor of Greek at Leyden, where he lectured to Vesalius and subsequently—as he became a Protestant—at Strassburg. He translated much of Galen, Oribasius, Alexander of Tralles and Paulus, and was the first to publish the second part of Caelius Aurelianus. These comparatively late translations before the Greek revival were a great service; and even afterwards found many more readers than did the Greek originals. Such translations as these, where the originals are available, are of no great interest to us now. But of certain earlier Latin renderings there is more to be said; occasionally they preserve for us texts or parcels of texts or

glosses of which otherwise we should have no knowledge, or no precise appreciation; and, intrinsically valueless as they may be, they may do more than this—they throw light upon the course of Greek culture in its ways and degrees in the Middle Ages. It is for such research that Heiberg has published this rendering by a translator of South Italy (of Beneventum) of an original of which many good and ancient Greek codexes are extant. The present volume contains but the document itself and its sources; the editor promises us his study of it, as a step in the history of Greek letters, at some future time; and we hope his promise will not be forgotten.

The best of the MSS., that which has been taken as the basis of this edition, is at Monte Cassino; and the editor thanks the librarians of the monastery for their courtesy and skilled assistance. He believes it to be in the handwriting of the translator himself. It seems to have been corrected, but little later, by another scribe who used not the Beneventan but a more common idiom ('vulgaris scriptura'). A codex in the Vatican is later and much inferior. Some use the editor made of this and

¹ Pauli Aeginetae opera: A Joanne Guinterio conversa, et illustrata commentariis. 8vo. Venetiis, 1553.

other MSS.; but he wisely decided to reproduce the orthographical inconsistencies, and also some obviously false syntax, 'quia sermonem barbarum interpretis conservare uolui'—and even indications of certain Greek barbarisms of historical interest are retained. There is added a useful index, 'Vocabulorum Graecorum aliorumque memorabilium.'

As regards the date of the Cassino codex, the editor puts it about the tenth century; certainly, as he judges by the Greek words in the margins which are probably by the translator himself, not before the ninth. It is a 'word by word' translation, and abounds in ridiculous errors.

To leave this volume for a moment and turn to the original author; Paul himself is of the seventh century; and one of the last of the Byzantine compilers. We are kindly disposed to make allowance for the plagiarists of former times on the ground that literary ethics had not then arisen. But this excuse may go beyond justice. Paul had before him the shining example of Oribasius, who scrupulously gave his authorities, but he took no such example; he annexed his spoils without making them his own in any literary or scientific sense, and even assumed to himself excerpts written in the first person. Still he has his value, as he preserved for us certain

portions of the compilations of Oribasius which are lost; and in his sixth, or surgical, book he handed down to us invaluable fragments of late Greek surgery which, adopted by the celebrated Arabian surgeon Albucasis, influenced the surgery of the later Middle Ages, Paul apparently practised in Alexandria, chiefly as an obstetrician and children's doctor; if so, he must have written just before the pillage by the Arabs and the consequent catastrophe of science and erudition; so that we may be thankful for what anyhow he saved. He may be regarded as our bridge between Celsus and Rhazes, Avicenna, Albucasis and the school of Salerno. After his time, in the eighth, ninth, and tenth centuries, till the rise of Salerno, Greek medicine had fallen deeply into decadence. This text of Heiberg's is interesting then not merely for its contents, indeed it contains not the most valuable part even of Paul, but also as an historical and literary document. It will be noted that this translation, like those of Nicholas of Reggio, and many others, issued from Magna Graecia, then of course a part of the Eastern Empire; we shall therefore look forward with anticipation to Heiberg's commentary on the document which he has so carefully reproduced.

CLIFFORD ALBUTT.

St. Radegunds, Cambridge.

SHORT NOTICES

Malta and the Mediterranean Race. By R. N. BRADLEY. With a map and 54 illustrations. London: Fisher Unwin, 1912. 8s. 6d. net.

THIS is an ambitious book. Its chief object, 'rather obfuscated by other matter' (p. 8), is 'to portray the psychological characteristics of the pre-Aryans in Europe, with a view to offer at least a partial solution to the problem how a people so advanced as the Cretan discoveries show them to have been, came to fall into insignificance at the onslaught of the less cultured Aryans.' To this topic the author has devoted 'two years'

work, accomplished in the short intervals allowed by official duty': but in Malta 'one gains conviction through the emotions rather than intellectually' (p. 10) on such matters as the 'comparative purity of the Maltese Race' (p. 11), the frequency, in English, of words which are at the same time Semitic and Hamitic (ch. xii.-xiii.), or the socialistic menage of Minoan Cnossus (p. 289). 'Conviction through the emotions' does not, however, preclude inconsistencies, as for example on p. 37, where the 'short skulls' and 'short-headed invaders' of Europe belong to the Aryans at the top of the

page, and to the Turanian family at the bottom. No doubt an emotional 'conviction' that burials are neolithic may result from the discovery of perforated marine shells in them (p. 56-7); but merely 'intellectual' archaeologists will continue to ask 'Why?' They will also require something more than emotional reasons for eccentricities like the 'Licians' (p. 108), 'Puglia' (p. 132), 'pyramidal times' (p. 205), or a rendering of history which ascribes the art of Athens to 'the good taste of Pericles acting on the natural genius of the Pelasgians' (p. 306), though 'against him was always arrayed the mob of the market-place, seen by us only through the aristocratic spectacles of Thucydides, a host of tanners and cattle-dealers under the leadership of Kleôn' (p. 292). Other hard sayings are the allusion to the 'combined Scotch and Roundhead régime at the end of the Stuart period' (p. 302), and the conclusion that 'though soldiers and sportsmen are not all brachycephals, they are nevertheless actuated by the brachycephalic spirit.' In fits of brachycephalic 'longheadedness,' however, the author has done what he could to test his theories on his friends (p. 314): 'I call to mind my longest-headed friend, now no longer living. . . . 'I have studied, too, a short-headed acquaintance with much interest. . . . 'What a pity to trammel 'conviction through the emotions' with appeals to the intellect such as this!

On p. 283 Mr. Bradley refers to a crisis in his own experience. 'Since I became a Sergian I see this combat of the long-heads and the short everywhere in European history.' But this is only part of the story. In philology he is no less a Rondonovskian, in folklore a Magrian, in Hittite lore a de-Carian—the Hittites, by the way, spoke Hamitic (p. 179)—in Spain a Siretian, in Egypt an Elliot-Smithian, in Ireland a Mrs. J. R. Greenian, in sociology a Primitive Paternitian.

On the other hand, 'the work deals not only with the Mediterranean Race but with Malta, and accordingly the earlier chapters are devoted to a sketch of the prehistoric monuments of the island and their relationships with those

of the Eurafrican peoples' (p. 12). In the author's opinion 'they are not the real subject of the book'; but mere 'intellectuals' may be pardoned if they find them the only readable part of it. For Mr. Bradley has worked in the Valletta Museum, and helped to excavate Santa Verna; and apart from occasional lapses into theory, he has made a good summary of the valuable work of the Maltese archaeologists. Frankly, Mr. Bradley should abjure Sergi and the rest, and become a Tagliaferro-Zammitian for good and all.

J. L. MYRES.

Pauly's Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft; neue Bearbeitung von G. WISSOWA . . . W. KROLL. 15ter Halbband. 8vo. 1 vol., cols. 1312. Stuttgart: Metzler, 1912. M. 15.

THE scale of this wonderful encyclopaedia shows distinct signs of increasing as it proceeds. Here we have a half-volume of 1312 columns, which takes us only from *Helikon* to *Hestia*, and that although one of the most important articles is omitted. It seems clear that at this rate the original estimate will be largely exceeded, as regards both the bulk of the publication and the time required for its completion. The editors and publishers have boldly grappled with the difficulty, and a second series of volumes, beginning with R, is to be begun. Although this will undoubtedly lead to the speedier completion of the encyclopaedia, it is doubtful whether a plan more like that adopted by the new English Dictionary would not have been better. Each volume would then have been not widely separated in date from its nearest neighbours; whereas, when the book is complete, the reader of Q will find it surprising that the information supplied under that letter will be so much more recent than under R. But we are grateful, in any case, for any plan for expediting the publication; not that, considering the circumstances, we have ever thought its progress less than remarkably rapid. The trials of an editor, in such a case, must be manifold. It must have been a bitter dis-

appointment to him to have to write, as it was to us to read, in column 528: 'On account of the illness of the writer the rest of the article has perforce been postponed to the Supplement.' And this is the important article *Herakles*! Twelve columns are taken up with the form of the name, and seven of them with the purely grammatical questions of the inflexion thereof. After this we are not surprised, though sorry, that the writer broke down. Another important article which has been postponed is that on *Herodes* (the kings of Judaea of that name; Herodes Atticus and twelve others receive due treatment). In spite of the failure of *Herakles*, this half-volume contains the important deities *Helios*, *Hephaistos*, *Hera*, *Hermes* (with a special article on *Hermes Trismegistos*), *Hercules* and *Hestia*. Of literary articles we may mention *Heliodoros*, *Hellankos*, *Herenius Philon*, *Herodianos*, *Heron*, *Herondas*, *Hesiodos*. The chief law-article is *Hereditarium ius* by Manigk. The article on *Philon* appears somewhat to underestimate the value of the *Φοινικικὴ ἱστορία*, which contains certain elements of sound tradition, though badly jumbled. The article on *Heliopolis* (2) seems to be written without concert with the following excellent article (by Dussaud) on *Heliopolitanus*. *Helioseiros*, the combination of *Helios* with *Osiris* found under this name at Chalcis ad Belum, deserved an entry. The city of *Hephaistias*, in Lemnos is omitted, although it is mentioned in Malten's excellent article on *Hephaistos*, col. 315. Under *Hera* we should have liked to see a reference to the cult of the Syrian *Hera* at Der-el-Qal'a in the Lebanon, near Berytus. To the places where games called *Herakleia* were celebrated add *Perinthus* and *Herakleia Salbake*. Under *Hermes* (or else under *Hermes-Trismegistos*) the *Hermes-Thoth* of Tyre might have been noticed. These are a few small points which have been noticed; but one's astonishment at the completeness of the book is not lessened as time goes on. This half-volume, we are glad to say, seems to show a much more thorough use of numismatic evidence than its predecessors.

G. F. H.

The Periplus of the Erythraean Sea: travel and trade in the Indian Ocean by a merchant of the first century. Translated and annotated by WILFRED H. SCHOFF, A.M., of the Commercial Museum, Philadelphia. Longmans, Green and Co., 1912.

THIS translation is based on Müller's text as emended by B. Fabricius (Leipzig: Veit, 1883). There is no difficulty in the style, and Mr. Schoff's rendering is plain enough, with occasional oddities like 'the designated ports' for ἀποδεδειγμένων ὁρμῶν. There is sometimes a difficulty in rendering the names of products and merchandise exactly; is σκουτουλάτος (*scutulatus*) really 'embroidered clothing,' or does that refer to the pattern? But the merchandise is really Mr. Schoff's strong point. He has nearly 250 pp. of notes on 30 pp. of text; and in these notes he has collected a mass of explanation and illustration upon geography, antiquities, and trade. Thus we have pages on Nubia, its history and trade-routes; on the city of Axium and Abyssinia; on oreichalcos, cotton, lac, cinnamon, sugar, and so forth. The illustrations are drawn not only from Pliny and the ancients, but from modern travellers and writers of many nations, even Oscar Wilde.

W. H. D. R.

Annual of the British School at Athens, XVI. Macmillan, 1909-10. 25s. net.

THIS number includes several papers on the Laconian excavations; a journey in South-West Asia Minor, by A. M. Woodward and H. A. Ormerod; Latin monuments at Chios, and a French inscription at Idalia, by F. W. Hasluck; Attic Building Records, and a Panathenaic Amphora from Cameiros, by A. M. Woodward; a note on Herodotus VI. 83; Terra Lemnia; North Greek Festivals; the Senmut Fresco; Dorian types in modern Greece; inscriptions from Praesos; a clay sealing from Egypt. The frontispiece is a coloured plate: Cretans bringing gifts, from the Senmut fresco, of which also a drawing from 1837 is reproduced (Plate XIV.).

It is difficult to summarise a summary,

and there is nothing sensational in the Spartan excavations of this season. There is a plan of the Orthian sanctuary, and we are told to expect full publication of the finds in a separate book. An inscription from Asia Minor (p. 107) has the picture of a *καλαυροψ*, represented as a shepherd's crook or boomerang, thus supporting the traditional meaning of the word. The Latin Monuments of Chios may call attention to the rich remains of castellated architecture in the Levant, and the many records of the Italian occupation. Mr. Woodward brings some important evidence as to the building of the Parthenon, from which it appears that the pediment sculptures were executed by others than Pheidias himself, who probably was not in Athens at the time. No doubt he designed them, but others carved them. Folklore plays a considerable part in this volume, not only in the note on the Hybristika, but in Mr. Wace's valuable account of certain North Greek festivals. In this he gives the traditional songs and a number of photographs. Another indication of the importance of modern Greece for the knowledge of antiquity is Mr. Hawes's paper on Some Dorian Descendants: he finds that there is much resemblance between Albanians, Izakonians, and Sphakians (why are they called Sphakians? they call themselves Sphakians), and that their claim to Dorian ancestry is not without reason. Amongst the inscriptions for Praesos one 'Eteocretan' fragment appears, but no key.

W. H. D. ROUSE.

Die metrische und rhythmische Komposition der Komödien des Aristophanes.
C. CONRADT. Pp. 40, 43. Parts 2 and 3. Leipzig: Fock, 1911, 1912.

DR. CONRADT continues and apparently concludes his numerical analysis of the lines making up the plays, and the divisions of the plays, of Aristophanes. It results as before (C. R. 24, 219) that they are invariably multiples of the number 14. Thus in the *Frogs* lines 1-673 make 49×14 , 674-737 4×14 , 738-1118 28×14 , and 1119-1433 28×14 , or 109×14 altogether; and smaller divisions turn out to be smaller multiples

of the same number. Occasionally this entails division at rather arbitrary points, and some alleged loss or insertion of verses has now and then to be conceded. The writer finds it of course impossible to maintain that the composition by sevens or fourteens is always, or even usually, well-marked, although he makes it emerge upon examination; and I am not sure that he will convince scholars of the system which he takes so much pains to establish and which he holds that Aristophanes took so much pains to observe.

HERBERT RICHARDS.

CICERO AD ATTICUM.

Cicero's Letters to Atticus, with an English Translation by E. O. WINSTEDT, M.A. Vol. I. Loeb Classical Series. Heinemann, 1912. 5s. net.

IN this volume, the first of eight, Mr. Winstedt—who has undertaken the formidable task of translating the whole of Cicero's letters—reaches the end of *ad Atticum* VI. He may be fairly congratulated on his work. It is accurate and readable, and, rarest of virtues in a translation, intelligible without the original. Novelty there are none: the law and the prophets, Tyrrell and Purser in particular, have been treated with punctilious respect. The text is eclectic and judicious; and it is satisfactory to find that Mr. Winstedt discards the hateful obelus, and, if the tradition is faulty, prints a conjecture without insisting upon certitude.

In the article of style, there is nothing of the Polite Letter-Writer about Mr. Winstedt: in fact, his affection for the vernacular is apt to blur the light and shade of the Latin. Cicero, for example, writes with deliberate balance: *Etenim, cum multos dies aures meas Acutilio dedissem, cuius sermonis genus tibi notum esse arbitror, non mihi grave duxi scribere ad te de illius querimoniis, cum eas audire, quod erat subdiosum, leve putassem. Sed abs te ipso, qui me accusas, unas mihi scito litteras redditas esse, cum et otii ad scribendum plus et facultatem dandi maiorem habueris.* His translator is content with a homelier simplicity: 'It was not the bother of writing you an account of his grievances

that I shirked. I spent several days listening to him, and you know his way of talking, and I did not mind though it was a bit of a bore. Though you grumble at me, I've only had one letter from you, let me tell you, and you have had more time to write and a better chance of sending letters than I've had.' It was hopeless to expect the *boni viri* to be other than conservatives; but why should the *improbi* be socialists? The syllogism is invalid—possibly in both cases—and the general reader, for whom the series is partially designed, might develop curious views upon the political situation at Rome. But Mr. Winstedt is modern throughout. *Animadverteram* becomes 'I had spotted'; *me miserum* 'poor devil'; *valde perturbati* 'in an awful muddle.' Vettius is 'jumped on' (Cicero says 'reprehended'), and is prevented from turning 'King's evidence'; Atticus inquires, perhaps pardonably, 'who the deuce' are the Pindenissitae, and is informed that the jury 'were a rotten lot.' We meet with Bedlam, money-lending jews, Hobson and his choice, pashas, and sheikhs. The modern note is also heard in phrases such as 'you know who I mean,' 'I will write oftener and fuller,' 'too out of pocket,' and so forth.

In dealing with Cicero's Greek, Mr. Winstedt follows the old convention: if there is not a French phrase handy, he has recourse to slang—presumably on the ground that it is, at least, not English. As a rule, he applies the method dexterously enough, though sometimes the salt has unquestionably lost his savour: so, for instance, when the pretty *non flocci facteon* reappears as 'must not give a button for . . .'

To return to the general reader, Mr. Winstedt would have shown a little more regard for his interests, had he filled his frugal seven pages of introduction with an outline of the circumstances in which the letters were written. The symbols *MCZ*, etc., are in themselves *φωναέντα συνετοῖσι*, and a matter of perfect indifference to everyone else. Similarly, the index might have been put to a better use, if one half had been eliminated and a skeleton biography attached to a few of the most prominent names: it is sheer waste of time to enumerate the pages on which the word *Roma* occurs.

Mr. Winstedt says that his notes have been 'confined to cases where they seemed absolutely necessary.' But what is his *clientèle*? How are we to envisage the reader who has to be told, some scores of times, how many sesterces go to a given number of pounds; who is unaware that Aristarchus was 'an Alexandrine grammarian noted especially for his criticism of the Homeric poems, in which he detected many spurious verses,' or that Archilochus was 'a Greek poet of Paros who wrote scathing verses'; while, at the same time, everything is sun-clear to him the moment he learns that 'Caesar wished to give Transpadane Gaul the full *civitas*; in which case they would become a *municipium* and elect a yearly board of *quattuorviri* instead of *duoviri*'?

These are small matters, however, and Mr. Winstedt has deserved well of his readers and of the series in which his book figures.

J. JACKSON.

Q. Horati Flacci Carmina recensuit FRIDERICUS VOLLMER. Editio Major Iterata et Correcta. Pp. viii + 404. Lipsiae in aedibus B. G. Teubneri. MCMXII.

THIS is a new edition of the Horace which appeared in the Teubner series in 1907, and which was noticed in the *Classical Review*, vol. xxii. It presents practically no fresh features that call for special notice. In the previous edition several conjectural emendations were advanced by the editor in the critical notes, though none of them were admitted to the text. Some of these conjectures are now omitted, and some new ones are introduced, and these modifications and a few minor corrections are the only changes the book exhibits. The same intricate and novel classification of the MSS. is retained and, as before, without any detailed explanation or discussion. Such explanation must still be sought in various articles in the *Philologus*, the *Rheinisches Museum*, the *Deutsche Literaturische Zeitung*, and *Hermes*. The article in the latter journal in particular contains a reassertion of the position the editor has taken up. It

might be well if a future edition contained a concise summary of the controversy. It is now difficult to follow as it lies embedded in the various journals named, which are not readily accessible to most readers.

A few misprints may be noted: *Odes* 3, 6, 24; *medidatur*, *Epodes* 8, 19; *ponoces*, *Sat.* 1, 2, 128 *latre*.

C. H. KEENE.

University College, Cork.

The Oxford Book of Latin Verse. From the earliest fragments to the end of the fifth century, A.D. Edited by H. W. GARROD, Fellow of Merton College. Foolscape 8vo. Pp. xliii + 531. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 6s.; or on India paper, 7s. 6d.

THIS is an excellent anthology; all the old favourites are there, from the right Horace and Catullus down to Hadrian's 'Animula vagula blandula.' We confidently recommend classical scholars to put the volume in their rucksack when upon a walking tour, for then, if they are not quite like the man (whom Lamb once met on a coach) who seemed to have all the Bodleian in his pockets, they will, at any rate—and with more comfort—have most of what they love in Latin poetry. In fact a good anthology like this makes one realise more than ever within how small a space what is valuable in Latin poetry can be put.

The introduction stresses the 'Italian' element as distinguished from what is either Greek or Roman, and very rightly points out that all Roman poetry was meant to be *read aloud*—a fact to which many characteristic features are traced. There is a very disparaging remark upon Juvenal on p. 39. To talk of 'the complete unreality of his moral code' and of 'a rhetoric which for ever just misses the fine effects which it laboriously calculates' is rather challenging. Mr. Garrod says that he has been guided in his selection by the desire to include only what is true poetry. If so, why so much Cicero? And the twenty-five to thirty pages of Statius may represent that poet fairly well, but Mr. Garrod's principle would have been better represented if he had included only the little

poem to Sleep, by which we chiefly wish to remember Statius.

There is a short appendix upon the Saturnian metre advocating the 'pure-accentual' theory. The semi-quantitative theory is dismissed rather too lightly in view of the fact that, as pointed out by Professor Arnold, whereas according to the accentual theory such words as *Náevio* and *pópulo* should be equally admissible in the third section, in the extant lines words like *Náevio* occur nearly twenty times as frequently as words like *pópulo* in that position. It seems that we really have not sufficient *data* to be didactic on a point like this. It may be true, as Professor Ramsay held, that the line 'depended for its effect upon the rhythm resulting from the pronunciation of a certain number of syllables in a certain cadence,' but quantity is part of rhythm and cannot be neglected to the extent to which the accentual theory neglects it.

There is also a note upon the Hymn of the Arval Brotherhood in which some very ingenious, but rather numerous, emendations are proposed, and an appendix of translations and imitations.

R. B. APPLETON.

Perse School, Cambridge.

Cornelii Taciti Annalium, Libri V., VI., XI., XII. With introductions and notes, abridged from the larger work of Henry Furneaux, M.A. By H. PITMAN, M.A., Lecturer in Classics at the University of Bristol. 2 maps. 1 vol. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press, 1912. 3s. 6d.

THIS volume 'is designed to serve the needs of students requiring a less copious and advanced commentary than that given in Mr. Furneaux's large edition,' and as such it seems to be satisfactory. The introductory chapters are carefully abridged and the surviving notes deal with the main difficulties. Still the process of compression is likely to involve a certain loss of juice, and the historical introductions make rather dry reading. Perhaps it would have been wiser to extinguish the section on syntax altogether; the book is intended for students on the brink of silver Latin, and a general account of tendencies like that

in Professor Summer's edition of the selected letters of Seneca, or, better still, a criticism of Tacitus on the lines of Norden in his *Antike Kunstsprosa*, would have been more stimulating. As it is we are told once more, as Dräger told Furneaux, that Tacitus prefers unusual forms like 'claritudo' and 'firmitudo' to the forms in 'as.' But there is no sign of the testimony of Gellius that the 'tudo' endings were accounted the more impressive. In one place there is a misleading omission on the question of Graecisms. Furneaux gives the right hint in his introduction, but Mr. Pitman has omitted the sentence in which that hint is contained. It would have been well even to strengthen the position by giving the substance of Nipperdey's note on the subject.

The notes on the text are generally well chosen, but the new versions added by Mr. Pitman are not always happy. Three instances will suffice: 'Sanctitate domus priscum ad morem' (V. 1), 'pure in her home life, in the old style'; 'virilibus curis feminarum vitia exuerat' (VI. 25), 'had put off feminine vices by assuming masculine interests,' where the idiomatic use of 'exuerat' is entirely missed; 'contumelia' (XI. 6), 'reprimand.' Sometimes the principle of selection is hard to follow. In the note on V. 4 'eoque—creditus' the reference to Suet. Tib. should surely have been given, and a reader is quite likely to be mystified in XII. 24 by the suppression of the reference to Suet. Cl. 41. As the note stands the correspondence between the speech of Claudius and the speech of Canuleius is left unexplained.

Some of the more difficult passages receive extra comment. VI. 16, however, is not made clearer by the doubtful interpretation of 'versura': the note on this passage at the foot of Professor Ramsay's translation is more satisfactory. In XII. 40 the commentary is rather deficient: something more should have been added about the relation of the movement there described to the events of *Historiae* III. 45.

Mr. Pitman was very likely right to refrain from much textual criticism. Since, however, he includes several minor points, 'principi,' VI. 26, 'oppe-riri,' XI. 12 (both notes are incomplete),

he might well have given some attention to the very interesting problem of 'tantum inter extrema superbiae gerebat,' XI. 37. There is the same want of scale in the note on 'praegressus' in that same chapter. There can be no doubt about its meaning, but the more difficult 'praefestinans' of V. 10 is passed over in silence.

The book is handy, and no misprints have been detected.

C. D. FISHER.

Christ Church, Oxford.

Sermo Latinus: a Short Guide to Latin Prose Composition. By J. P. POSTGATE, Litt.D. New edition, revised and greatly augmented. Pp. vi+186. Macmillan and Co.

ALL teachers of Latin will welcome the reappearance of *Sermo Latinus* in a new and enlarged edition: if the present reviewer may judge at all for himself, they will more and more recognise with increasing experience its excellence as a guide for both learner and instructor. Nothing material has been changed, as nothing needed to be changed, in the introductory part. 'Read some portion of a Latin author before translating an English passage,' 'Avoid out-of-the-way words,' 'No sentence is well constructed unless it compels the reader to go on to the end before he can satisfy himself'—the rules for order, the rules for metaphors, all the old and none the less admirable maxims are still there, not supplying any 'easy road to Latin Prose,' but putting in the hands of pupils the implements whereby they may achieve the difficult but most educative and repaying task of recasting English thought in a Latin form. This part of the book is the same: the passages selected for translation have been much increased in number. There are versions of all in an accompanying Key: the names of the authors, which include those of M. T. Cicero, C. J. Caesar, and T. Livius, may be generally taken as a guarantee of scholarship. It would be difficult, and perhaps dangerous, to attempt to award the palm. A reviewer may hesitate between one or two of Dr. Verrall's, a version by Cicero of a passage about 'Mr. Sullivan' and 'Pun-

nett' (whom Tully calls, one hardly knows why, Autronius), and Dr. Postgate's own renderings of Dickens and Miss Austen. To say nothing of a Latin Mrs. Bennet, who would have thought that Mr. Alfred Jingle's apologue of Don Bolaro Fizgig and the stomach-pump would go into Latin prose? Yet it does, and reads like a page of Petronius. Any student of enterprise should be tempted by agreeable *jours de force* like these. In general, of course, the proposed tasks are less exciting, as one would expect. The English passages are very well chosen. They are often difficult, but never without some kind of kinship to Latin which makes them translatable. So many examiners seem to confuse

what is legitimately difficult—what *can* be done, given skill and knowledge—with what really can no more be put into a proper Latin form any more than can a page of Bradshaw or a column of musical criticism! But Dr. Postgate is too old a hand for that.

Another new feature of the book is its Appendix. The first part of this summarises rules given in the Introduction, and illustrates them by reference to the select passages. The second part consists of a series of notes on the passages, showing some of the more important words which a translator should keep in mind. Both sections should be most useful.

A. D. G.

CORRESPONDENCE

ANCIENT TOBOGGANING.

To the Editors of the CLASSICAL REVIEW.

Plutarch, *Vita Marii*, XXIV. 3.

Οἱ Κίμβριοι.

Τοῖς δὲ τοσούτοις περιῇν ὑποφίας καὶ θράσους κατὰ τῶν πολεμίων, ὥστε, ῥώμην καὶ τόλμην ἐπιδεικνύμενοι μᾶλλον ἢ πράττοντες τι τῶν ἀναγκαίων, γυμνοὶ μὲν ἠνείχοντο νικώμενοι καὶ διὰ τῶν καὶ χιόνος βαθείας τοῖς ἀκροῖς προσέβαινον, ἄνωθεν δὲ τοὺς θυρεοὺς πλατεῖς ὑποτίθεντες τοῖς σώμασι, εἴτα ἀφίεντες αὐτοὺς ὑπεφέροντο κατὰ κρημῶν ὀλισθήματα καὶ λισσάδας ἀχανεῖς ἐχόντων.

Might I suggest to the managers of the Public School Alpine Sports that a competition, conducted rigidly under the above conditions, would afford an interesting test for comparing ancient and modern vitality and hardihood?

A. A. CORDNER.

12, Grosvenor Sq., Rathmines, Dublin.

To the Editors of THE CLASSICAL REVIEW.

In reading the *Choephore*, I am puzzled by the striking phrase *χαλκηλάτῳ πλάστιγγι* 290. Hesychius and the *Etymologicum Magnum* offer the explanation, which is most usually adopted—viz. *πλάστιγγῃ ἢ μάστιγι, ἀπὸ τοῦ πλίσσειν*. This would appear to be a mere conjecture, as the regular meaning of *πλάστιγγῃ* is the 'scale-pan' of a balance, and it is also used by Hippocrates to mean a 'splint' for keeping broken bones in place. This suggests, rather, a derivation from *πλάσσω*. Moreover, how could a whip be called *χαλκηλάτος*, 'beaten out into metal'? The general signification of *πλάστιγγῃ*, especially when coupled with *χαλκηλάτος* seems to be a flat plate of metal. Is it possible, then, that it might have the same

meaning as the word 'lamina' in Lucretius (Bk. III. 1017), 'verbera carnifices robur pix lamina taedae,' and refer to the torture of the red-hot plate? I cannot find anything to show that such a torture was familiar to the Greeks, as it must have been to the Romans; cf. Horace, *Epistles*, I. 15. 34, 'scilicet ut ventres lamna candente nepotum diceret urendos, correctus Bestius.' But all these tortures were probably Semitic in origin, and it would seem, from the parallel passage in the *Eumenides*, ll. 186 sqq., that the Erinyes (whose persecutions are being described in this passage of the *Choephore*) would have been quite at home in an Eastern torture-chamber. It may be an intentional imitation by Lucretius, or a mere coincidence, that the 'pix' in the line quoted seems to indicate the *πισσοκώνητος* μόρος, which is described just above in l. 268 of the *Choephore*—θανόντας ἐν κηκίδι πισσῇ φλογός.

EDWARD J. POWELL.

Magdalen College, Oxford.

To the Editors of the CLASSICAL REVIEW.

I am desirous of getting as complete a catena as possible of passages in ancient literature relating to Rome—chiefly the city—illustrating the place it held in the minds and affections of people down the ages. Any quotations will greatly oblige.—Yours faithfully,

WILLIAM C. TUTING, D.D.

Sithney Vicarage, Helston, Cornwall.

June 27, 1913.

XENOPHON, *HELLENICA* II. ii.: THE CONSPIRACY OF THE ΚΑΛΑΜΗΦΟΡΟΙ.

To the Editors of the CLASSICAL REVIEW.

Will you please allow me space to retract my note under the above heading in vol.

xxvi., p. 186? Professor Campbell Bonner, of the University of Michigan, very kindly points out to me that my suggestion that the *ὀφθαλμῶν* was not a conspirator, but that the *κάλamos* he carried was connected with his disease, was anticipated by Van Leeuwen on *Ar. Ach.* 1033, σὺ δ' ἄλλὰ μοι σταλαγμὸν εἰρήνης ἔνα | ἐς τὸν καλαμίσκον εὐστάλαξον τουτονί. Van Leeuwen explains the patient's *κάλamos* and Dicaeopolis's *καλαμίσκος* as a cheap form of medicine-phial (cf. the *νάρθηξ* tinder-box of Prometheus); while the badge of the conspirators he supposes to have been a garland, or at least a sprig of reed worn on the head (cf. *Nub.* 1006, στεφανωσάμενος καλὰ μὲν λευκῷ). Professor Bonner, in a learned paper in the *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, vol. xxxix., 1909, supports Van Leeuwen in the main, but would make the *κάλamos* badge not a garland, but a mere arbitrary symbol, perhaps a baton consisting of a joint or two of reed, and carried in the hand; he gives some very late quotations for the use of short cuttings of reed as tokens. The Professor anticipates but rejects my idea that the *κάλamos* was a walking-cane; even if the word can bear that meaning, a walking-cane would be too undistinctive for the badge of a conspiracy. He then gives considerable evidence for *κάλamos*, *καλαμίσκος* and *νάρθηξ* used as small receptacles,

especially for drugs. An interesting passage is *Plut. Dem.* 29 f., where Demosthenes commits suicide by sucking poison from his reed-pen: 'the *κάλamos* was probably the original receptacle in which Demosthenes had procured the drug. In order to give the poison-reed the appearance of a harmless pen, it was only necessary to trim and sharpen one end of it.' Whether to make the *καλαμίτης ἥρως* of *de Cor.* 129 'a canonised Dr. Pillbox, a sort of St. Bolus,' and whether to suppose the *βιβλίον* *ἀς ἐδόκει* in the hand of Lucian's Toxaris, the (*ένος* *ιατρός* worshipped at Athens (*Luc. Scythia* 1), to have been really a *νάρθηξ* of drugs, are questions that the Professor leaves open.—Yours, etc.,

H. RACKHAM.

Christ's College, Cambridge.

ON JUVENAL, SAT. I. 144.

'Hinc subitae mortes atque intestata senectus.'

To the Editors of the CLASSICAL REVIEW.

Mr. D. A. Slater's 'intercepta' (suggested on p. 160 of this volume), though it may give the sense required, seems to me to be lacking in probability. I would read, as being more probable, 'interlecta' (i.e., 'nipped in the bud'), a rare word easily mistakable for 'intestata.' $r=s$, $l=l$, $ec=a$ (open).

SAMUEL ALLEN.

BOOKS RECEIVED

Publishers and Authors forwarding books for review are asked to send at the same time a note of the price.

. Excerpts and Extracts from Periodicals and Collections are not included in these Lists unless stated to be separately published.

Amaryllis. Carmen Raphaelis Cariozzari Ferrariensis, in certamine poetico Hoeufftiano promio aureo ornatum. 10" × 6½". Pp. 146. Amsterdam: J. Muller, 1913.

Babelon (E.) Moneta. 11½" × 9". Pp. 56. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1913. Fr. 2.30

Bidez (J.) Vie de Porphyre: avec les fragments des traités *περί ἀγαλμάτων* et *De Regressu Animae*. 9½" × 6¼". Pp. viii + 166 + 73.

Briess (E. E.) Le Prétendu ΠΟΗΠΑΙΟΣ ΣΤΡΑΤΗΓΟΣ. 10" × 6½". Pp. 47-52. Paris: E. Leroux, 1913.

Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum. Vol. LV. S. Eusebii Hieronymi Opera (Sect. I., Pars II.). Epistularum, Pars II. Epistulae LXXI.-CXX. Recensuit Isidorus Hilberg. 9½" × 6". Pp. 516. Leipzig: G. Freytag, 1912. M. 16.

Dorez (L.) Notice sur un Recueil de Poésies Latines, et un Portrait de l'Humaniste Véronais Leonardo Montagna. 11½" × 9". Pp. 34. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1913. Fr. 2.

Map of the Near and Middle East from Rome to Babylon, etc. With ancient and modern names in special character. Mounted on

rollers and varnished. 40" × 30". London: G. W. Bacon and Co., 1913. 6s.

Mochon (E.) Un Décret du Dème de Chologos relatif aux Theosophories. 11½" × 9". Pp. 24. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1913. Fr. 1.50.

Riepl (W.) Das Nachrichtenwesen des Altertums, mit besonderer Rücksicht auf die Römer. 9" × 6". Pp. xiv + 478. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1913. M. 16.

Skoorb (D. R.) In Four Dimensions. 7" × 4½". Pp. 64. Leather. Saginaw, Mich., U.S.A.: D. R. Skoorb and Co.

Spohr (L.) Instrumenta Graeca Publica et Privata (Pars Prima). Papyri Jandanae (Fasciculus Tertius). 9½" × 6½". Pp. 79-123. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1913. M. 2.80.

Swindler (Mary H.) Cretan Elements in the Cults and Ritual of Apollo. Bryn Mawr College Monographs, Vol. XIII. 9" × 6". Pp. 80. Bryn Mawr, Pa., 1913.

Teubner's Text. Procopii Caesariensis Opera Omnia (J. Haury). Vol. III. 2. 7" × 4½". Pp. x + 395. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1913. M. 7.50.

Teuffel (W. S.) Römische Literatur (Dritter Band). Die Literatur von 96 nach Chr. bis zum Ausgange des Altertums. 9" × 6". Pp. viii + 579. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1913. M. 10.